

The Classical Journal

PUBLISHED BY THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE MIDDLE WEST AND SOUTH
WITH THE CO-OPERATION OF THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW ENGLAND
AND THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE PACIFIC STATES

Volume XXIII

APRIL, 1928

Number 7

Editorial: Prove All Things The New England Program	481
A Thucydidean Paraenetic Discourse	Paul Shorey 485
Reading the Classics, II	Clarence P. Bill 489
Shall We Teach Our Pupils to Read Latin?	W. L. Carr 500
What Price Method?	Dorrance S. White 511
A Fifteenth-Century Guide to Latin Conversation for University Students	Lillian Gay Berry 520
The Egypt of the Greek Romances	E. Marion Smith 531
Notes	538
On Cavalry Charges with Bridleless Horses	Eugene S. McCartney
Vergil <i>Georgics</i> iii. 498 ff.	Homer F. Rebert
Herodotus and Benjamin Franklin	John A. Scott
Hints for Teachers	543
Book Reviews	548
<i>Lucian, Satirist and Artist</i> , Francis G. Allinson (Lord); <i>Ovid and His Influence</i> , Edward Kennard Rand (Coon); <i>Demosthenes: De Corona and De Falsa Legatione</i> , C. A. and J. H. Vince; <i>Demosthenes and His Influence</i> , Charles Darwin Adams (Tracy); <i>A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament</i> , H. E. Dana and Julius R. Mantey (Kleist); <i>Antiquity</i> , O. G. S. Crawford (Fraser); <i>The Etruscans</i> , David Randall-MacIver (Agard).	
Recent Books	560

PRINTED AT
THE TORCH PRESS
CEDAR RAPIDS IOWA

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

Published by the Classical Association of the Middle West and South, with the co-operation of the
Classical Association of New England and the Classical Association of the Pacific States

Editors-in-Chief

FRANK J. MILLER
The University of Chicago

ARTHUR T. WALKER
The University of Kansas

Editor for New England

HARRY M. HUBBELL
Yale University

Editor for the Pacific States

HERBERT C. NUTTING
The University of California

Associate Editors

GEORGE H. CHASE
Harvard University

VICTOR D. HILL
Ohio University

WALTER MILLER
University of Missouri

WALTER A. EDWARDS
Los Angeles High School

GEORGE HOWE
University of North Carolina

JOHN A. SCOTT
Northwestern University

CLARENCE W. GLEASON
Roxbury Latin School, Boston

DANIEL W. LOTHMAN
East High School, Cleveland

BERTHOLD L. ULLMAN
University of Chicago

Business Manager
ROY C. FLECKINGER
University of Iowa

Correspondence should be addressed as follows:

Concerning Manuscripts and Book Reviews, in general to Arthur T. Walker, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas. But manuscripts from the New England States should be sent to Harry M. Hubbell, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut; from the Pacific States, to Herbert C. Nutting, University of California, Berkeley, California.

Concerning Special Departments, to those named at the head of each department.

Concerning Membership in the Associations:

In the Classical Association of the Middle West and South, to W. L. Carr, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan. For the states included in this association, see the inside of the back cover.

In the Classical Association of New England, to John S. Galbraith, Williams College, Williamstown, Massachusetts.

In the Classical Association of the Pacific States, to Fred L. Farley, College of the Pacific, Stockton, California. The states included in this association are California, Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, and Arizona.

Concerning Subscriptions (of those who are not members of one of the associations named above), to W. L. Carr, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Concerning Advertisements, to Roy C. Fleckinger, Business Manager, Iowa City, Iowa.

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL is printed monthly except in July, August, and September by The Torch Press, Cedar Rapids, Iowa. The subscription price is \$2.50 per year; the price of single copies is 30 cents. Orders for service of less than a half-year will be charged at the single-copy rate. Postage is prepaid by the publishers on all orders from the United States, Mexico, Cuba, Porto Rico, Panama Canal Zone, Republic of Panama, Bolivia, Colombia, Honduras, Nicaragua, Peru, Hawaiian Islands, Philippine Islands, Guam, Samoan Islands, Shanghai. For all other countries in the Postal Union, an extra charge of 25 cents is made on annual subscriptions (total \$2.75); on single copies 3 cents (total 33 cents).

The membership fee in each of the associations named above is \$2.00 a year, with the addition of 25 cents a year for Canadian members, for postage. This fee includes subscription to the JOURNAL at a special rate. See the back cover page.

Claims for Missing Numbers should be made within the month following the regular month of publication. The publishers expect to supply numbers free only when losses have been sustained in transit and when the reserve stock will permit.

Twenty-five Reprints are furnished free to the authors of major articles, book reviews, and notes. Additional reprints, if ordered in advance, are supplied at cost. Orders for additional reprints should accompany the corrected proof.

Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office at Cedar Rapids, Iowa, on October 16, 1922, and additional entry as second-class matter at Ann Arbor, Michigan, under Act of August 24, 1912. Acceptance for mailing at the special rate of Postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on October 16, 1922.

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

VOLUME XXIII

APRIL, 1928

NUMBER 7

Editorial

PROVE ALL THINGS

The last few years have been notably marked by a tendency to disregard the teaching of experience and to venture out upon untried ways. The leaders in such ventures may indeed reap a reward; but often heavy is the loss suffered by the victims of the experiment.

The classics have not been unaffected by the tendency of the times. For example, some years ago the direct method of teaching Latin was given an enthusiastic trial; but it was found to be a failure in American schools, partly because adequately qualified teachers were lacking, partly because our students do not pursue the study of Latin long enough to give the method full play. In England, under the most favored conditions, it is hardly before the third year that the pupil thus trained really finds himself.

Yet, disregarding the lesson taught by this experiment, an attempt has lately been made on a large scale to introduce into beginning Latin essential features of the direct method, by substituting a process of guessing and approximation for a specific and incisive mastery of Latin forms and syntax.

In support of this procedure, the theory is advanced that there is valuable mental training in guessing and floundering about. Without discussing the question of the relative worth of such training, it is interesting to note that the theory is not one very likely to appeal either to the enemies or to the friends of the classics.

Thus, when Dr. Abraham Flexner was fulminating against the subjects he would not admit to the Modern School, his indictment ran:

These figures mean that, instead of getting orderly training by solving difficulties in Latin translation or composition, pupils guess, fumble. . .¹

Conversely, in the CLASSICAL JOURNAL a professor of chemistry has recently expressed his faith in Latin training as a preparation for the study of science, on the ground that the study of Latin is a training, not in guessing, but in the application of exact information.²

To meet these conditions, Latin forms and their general meanings must be memorized until they are letter perfect, and so the rules of syntax. In the application of this knowledge the pupil will get the exact training that prepares for science study.

In this connection it may be noted that, with utter disregard for fact, it is sometimes claimed that the by-products of Latin will not be realized unless a large part of the time that might be devoted to Latin itself is deflected to an intensive cultivation of these side-issues. On the contrary, with a thorough grounding in essentials and an unswerving devotion to the end of learning to read Latin, the development of by-products (such as insight into the derivation of English words) follows as a matter of course, and with little attention to that phase of the subject. This was very neatly demonstrated not long ago by an investigator who thought that he was proving something quite different.³

It is much to be feared that, in the classics, we are suffering from the same deterioration that today is affecting education generally. In catering to the inefficient and the uninterested, some are adopting spoon-feeding methods in place of a sturdier regime. Hear Miss Gildersleeve:

¹ *A Modern School, Occasional Papers*, No. 3, General Education Board, p. 18.

² "The Classics and Pure Science," by Arthur E. Hill, CLASSICAL JOURNAL, XXIII, January, 1928, espec. p. 244.

³ Cf. comments on the Philadelphia experiment, CLASSICAL JOURNAL, XXI, October, 1925, pp. 5 ff.

Our lamentable failure to do the best for our best students has been caused also by a sad misconception of democracy, by our mistakenly applying political science principles to educational methods. We have assumed that because all men are born politically free and equal they must have identical educational opportunities, however unequal they may be intellectually. . . . Whatever our faults, we Americans are . . . deeply attached to our children. . . . We want them to enjoy themselves, to be always comfortable, always amused, never troubled.⁴

The above remarks are suggested by the fact that many a teacher, who is getting satisfactory results by standard methods of Latin instruction, is yet rendered uncomfortable because of pressure of one kind or another to make a change from certainty to uncertainty, on the ground that one should keep "abreast of the times."

When the *Report of the Classical Investigation* was new, Professor Lodge issued a "Catechism" on that subject, and one of the items reads as follows:

Ques. Should I immediately change my method of teaching not only translation, but Latin in general, as a result of the recommendations contained in the Report?

Ans. Not until you are sure that you can get better results by such a change.

This bit of sound advice seems even more needed today than when the words were written. It is no evidence of a closed mind to stand for the principle "Prove all things"; rather it is a mark of common sense. The burden of proof lies decidedly with the educational innovation; it is for the teacher to judge, and to hold fast to that which is found to be good.

H. C. N.

⁴ *The Educational Record*, Vol. VIII, No. 3, cited in the *Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors*, XIII, No. 7, p. 507.

PROGRAM FOR THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE
CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW ENGLAND AT
DEERFIELD ACADEMY, DEERFIELD, MASS-
ACHUSETTS, FRIDAY AND SATURDAY,
MARCH 30 AND 31

FRIDAY, 11:00 A.M.

1. Welcome by HEADMASTER FRANK L. BOYDEN, Deerfield Academy, with Response by MISS LAURA K. PETTINGELL, President of the Association.
2. "The Teaching of Derivatives as Treated in Some Elementary Latin Books," LESTER M. PRINDLE, University of Vermont.
3. Reports and Business, including the election of officers.

FRIDAY, 2:30 P.M.

1. "Some Unsupported Views of Dido," J. EDMUND BARSS, The Loomis School.
2. "The Purpose of Tragedy; a new explanation of Aristotle's 'through pity and fear'," GEORGE M. CHASE, Bates College.
3. "Summer Travel in Greece," RUSSEL M. GEER, Brown University.

FRIDAY, 8:30 P.M.

1. "Classical Studies on the University Cruise," GEORGE E. HOWES, Williams College.
2. "Some Eastern Outposts of Rome" (Illustrated), KARL P. HARRINGTON, Wesleyan University.

SATURDAY, 9:30 A.M.

1. "The High Adventure," EDNA WHITE, President, Classical Association of the Middle Atlantic States.
2. "The Poet Martial and his World," JOHN W. SPAETH, JR., Brown University.
3. "Some New Facts regarding the Caesura in Latin Hexameter," PHILIP B. WHITEHEAD, University of Vermont.
4. "The 'Terentian' Comedies of a Tenth Century Nun," CORNELIA C. COULTER, Mount Holyoke College.

A THUCYDIDEAN PARAENETIC DISCOURSE¹

By PAUL SHOREY
University of Chicago

I have been asked to assist in something for which I am singularly unfitted, the firing of the popular heart. I am not a Fourth of July orator, and I have already expended in print the greater part of my available ammunition. But it is not difficult to repeat the commonplaces that embody the sentiment of a meeting when you yourself have a genuine faith in them. And as I most powerfully and potently believe in the cause of Classical Studies and in the value of organization, I am glad to take this opportunity of saying so.

It was Bacon, I think, who said that every man is a debtor to his profession. He might have added that if we generously pay the debt the profession returns it with interest. For the dignity and happiness of our daily labor depend not so much on the nature of the task as on the moral temper in which it is accomplished, and the breadth of intellectual outlook that relates it to larger issues and transfigures it in the light of ideal ends. The soulless, joyless man, Wordsworth tells us, is he who views all things in disconnection and isolation. We may take what view we please of our professional taskwork. We may regard it as so much distasteful toil to be got through doggedly as a puppy tends a spit, or we may conceive it, if not *sub specie aeternitatis*, at least *sub specie humanitatis*. We may dree our weird of drudgery in spiritual isolation, or we may think of our work humanly in connection with other laborers in the same field, and scientifically in relation to all other forms of intellectual endeavor. We may think of ourselves as lonely drill masters and hapless dishers up of the *crambe repetita* of ἐντεῦθεν ἐξελαύνει and *Gallia est omnis divisa*, or we

¹ Addressed to a rally of summer students at the University of Chicago.

may think of ourselves as co-workers in the great task of maintaining the national culture and keeping alive the historical consciousness in a materialistic age — and even as possible contributors of a brick to the stately edifice of knowledge which undismayed philology persists in rearing in the face of the flaunting palaces of science. (No invidious allusions to the Hull Biological Laboratories!) This choice is before you. And if now, as the hour of half-past two approaches,² your audition detects in my admonition a Thucydidean inspissation of periphrastic antithesis, it is not counter to probability, look you, that by the habituation of five weeks, and at the same time laboriously exercising the tongue, even beyond its native capacity, it should gain the acquired faculty of expressing its own thoughts in alien idiom.

In the immediate crisis of the present occasion you who sit there listening are as it were the soldiers of the classical army, and I who stand here speaking (unwillingly chosen to this office) am so to say (not to speak at length among you who know it all) the general who delivers to you no longer instruction but a reminder of encouragement, of all doing your duty as each possesses of celerity. Soldiers, be not discouraged by the numbers and audacity of your opponents. For they are more likely to affront you than confront you, and, as Socrates says, votes should be weighed not counted. [The banner under which you fight is not the yellow of journalism, but the cerulean hue of Minerva's stocking.] If they tell you that the classics are dead, weigh against that censure the praise that the dead words of Plato and Socrates are of more avail for the life of the spirit than the living deeds of those who in the name of psychology monkey with the simian and tabulate the gyrations of the white rodent. If they boast of the exact discipline of science, reply that the culture which you derive from Greek poetry and art they cannot find in the test tube, but the dissection which they practice upon the batrachian it is optional to you to undertake upon the optative. If they say that the classics are a lost cause, while they make gains every year, answer

² The class in Thucydides met at that hour. Hence the style of the following paragraphs, for which see Dionysius of Halicarnassus on Thucydides.

with a neat turn of the neuter abstract participle that it is in your not getting together that their getting ahead consists, and that when you have all joined the Classical Association of the Middle West and South — 3600 strong — there will be another tale to tell. And let not your zeal for the useful of this association be taken out of you by the burdensome of the annual dues. For being touched in your own city for two dollars as your contribution to the common good you will receive as your private guerdon the getting into touch with scholars in other cities. And let not the *Socii Latini*, the Latin allies, be deceived by the specious plea that if you betray Greek to the enemy the danger will not draw nigh to you also. And do not suppose that the contest for you will now be for Greek alone, but far rather for the totality of classical scholarship. For, as Isocrates said, Greek is not the name of a community of blood, but of a participation in a culture. It is a slight thing to suppress the one little Greek class in your high school. But that little thing involves the whole test and confirmation of your classical faith. And if you yield on this point, another and still another imposition will be laid upon you, till you will unawares find yourselves in the position of the medieval barbarians who for a thousand years tried the experiment of studying Latin without Greek for a major with results patent to all men. For as Greek and Latin were lovely in their life so in what we call their death, which is their life in the ideal, it is a law of the spirit that they shall not be divided.

But as you perceive from my recourse to Scriptural allusion my Thucydides has run out, as Lucian's Zeus says in the Council of the Gods. So I must come down from the heights and repeat in the plainest vernacular that the organization of the classical teachers of this great territory is a cause to which every classical teacher should lend his name and support even if he have not the time and strength to attend every meeting or participate actively in the work. With it the individual teacher is a link in the great chain and member of the great brotherhood of scholars throughout the world. Without it (or something like it in his life) he is a lonely gerund grinder in darkest Texas or remotest Oregon.

Hoc quoque te manet ut pueros elementa docentem
Occupet extremis in vicis balba senectus.

Nowhere is the contrast more startling than in classical philology between the insignificance of the individual and the grandeur of the collective achievement. The simple paper presented at one of our meetings or inserted in the JOURNAL is less than nothing; but the reconstruction of 1400 years of the greatest continuous civilization in history — the interpretation and assimilation by the modern mind of the deepest philosophy, the noblest poetry, the most perfect art in the world are not slight things. This task was achieved and can be continued only by joint and organized effort. The work will go on. The only question before the meeting is whether America, whether we, whether the teachers of this Middle West and South will take their proper place in it.

READING THE CLASSICS, II

By CLARENCE P. BILL,
Western Reserve University

As a result of my former article on this subject, published in the *CLASSICAL JOURNAL* for November, 1926, some rather pointed comment has come to me. It was all very well to talk about teaching people to read, but just how was it to be done? Devices were mentioned and discussed, to be sure, in various places, particularly in the *Report of the Classical Investigation*, Vol. I, pp. 188 ff., but they were not combined into a system, and one did not see just when and to what extent each was to be used, or how they were to be worked into the time available. It is to meet this challenge that I am writing once more about a subject already much discussed. For mere verbal convenience I shall speak of Latin, but what I have to say applies to Greek as well.

I shall not deal with the teaching of accidentence, syntax, or prose composition, except by implication, for they are reasonably well taken care of in the best elementary books.¹ Nothing that I say implies neglect of them; but the two things which most need stress are mastery of the Latin order and persistent systematic acquisition of vocabulary.

By mastery of the order I mean such a familiarity with it as will enable one quickly and easily to get the meaning of a sentence as the words go past. Ability to describe the order and its peculiarities is not enough. What I refer to is growing so accustomed to it that it becomes substantially second nature. It is one thing to know the accidentence, syntax, and vocabulary of a language; it is another thing to be able to apply all this knowledge quickly and unconsciously as the sentence unfolds. The latter is an accomplishment that results only from much practice. Our students must

¹ See also *Report of the Classical Investigation*, Vol. I, pp. 217-226; 228-233.

have such practice, and they must have it from the very beginning of their study.²

Persistent systematic acquisition of vocabulary implies not simply the learning of a certain number of well-selected words every day, but the use of these words at intervals calculated to fix them permanently in mind. We all realize that words will not stick unless met at proper periods, yet how much pains are really taken to see that each of them is so met? Furthermore, this systematic acquisition of vocabulary must be kept up throughout the Latin of high school and college.

In mastering the order the ear must help. Language is primarily meant to be heard, and the ear is a faster instrument for its comprehension than the eye. The best books, to be sure, advise oral training; but their advice is not sufficiently emphatic and comprehensive. They say the Latin should be read aloud before translation; but they seldom insist that it should be so read from the very earliest stages of Latin study, and that such reading should be an invariable part of every recitation and of the preparation of every recitation. To tell students that they must practice orally when preparing their lessons is largely futile, unless they know they will be called upon to do in class what they have been told to practice, and that the way they do it will play an important part in determining the grade of their work. The Latin set for translation in each new lesson should therefore be read aloud in class without fail, each student first reading the passage he is expected to translate.

At the beginning this oral work will be largely practice in pronunciation. But not more than two or three lessons of the beginner's book should go by before the first attempts are made by the

² Professor Franklin H. Potter in the *CLASSICAL JOURNAL*, XXIII (1927), p. 23, closes his article on "Training for Comprehension" with the statement that beyond teaching forms and vocabularies and syntax the teacher "can only advise the pupil how to proceed." I believe the teacher can do much more than advise. By giving the pupil the proper exercises and plenty of them he can and should drill the technique into him. In teaching comprehension we must of course guard against inaccuracy, as I have said below; but Professor Potter, who clearly believes in training for comprehension, lays unnecessary emphasis, it seems to me, on the difficulties involved.

pupil at reading "with expression," that is, putting together the words that in sense go together, pausing where the sense allows, and emphasizing the words which the sense makes emphatic — in other words reading as though he meant what he reads. Thereafter expressive reading should be unremittingly striven for — the pupil must undertake to show by the way he reads that he knows the sense. He cannot do this without having the sense in mind as he goes along.

Starting thus with the simpler phrases, this exercise must be kept up throughout the whole of the student's Latin study, so that he gradually learns to read Latin of greater and greater complexity and difficulty "with the sense behind it." Translation may under proper circumstances be omitted, but the reading aloud must not be omitted.

At first the thing of most importance in cultivating expressive reading is to observe the pauses allowed by the sense, exaggerating them somewhat, in order to group words that are closely connected and set them off from the next group; for the sense should be caught in the smallest portions possible and with all possible completeness, as the sentence progresses. Professor Frank Gardner Moore, in his *Porta Latina: A Reading Method for the Second Year* (Boston, 1915), marks such pauses. As the power of grouping words grows by this practice, increasing attention should be paid to the introduction of proper emphasis, until the pupil can read his Latin with as much expression as English.

Suppose now that the teacher himself has always followed the "analytic" method and never read in the way just spoken of. He would do well to take a proper course in a good summer school or other "extension" school; but, if that must be postponed, he can probably, with a reasonable amount of extra time for the preparation of each lesson, make a satisfactory beginning by himself, and, as he improves his own technique, can be teaching himself to read while he teaches his pupils to do it. A teacher who has thoroughly mastered the meaning of a sentence or passage by the analytic method — especially if he has been over it a number of times — should be able to handle the reading of it in class if he

will first practice it aloud by himself, applying the same principles of expression he would apply to a passage of English. He can also find help in the Latin reader mentioned above.

While the pupil is on the beginner's book, there will naturally be a daily review of the preceding lesson. Instead of having the Latin of this review translated in the usual way, the teacher should read this Latin aloud to the class and have them give the meaning of it without seeing the book. This should be done from the very start. At first, when sentences are short, it will be an easy exercise, and if it is properly kept up it will never get too hard. It compels the pupil, more than anything else does, to get the sense in the Latin order, become accustomed to that order, and learn the sound of the language.

The meaning should be given by the pupil phrase by phrase, the teacher pausing for it wherever the sense allows a pause and not waiting for the end of the sentence unless the sentence is very short. At first pupils cannot be expected to take in much at a time and should be given as small pieces as are capable of being put into English. They should give the meaning of each phrase with the greatest literalness, in order to increase familiarity with the Latin order and emphasize the differences between Latin and English in order and idiom. I know the objection will at once be raised that this produces an intolerable mess of words, pulls the English language all out of shape, and damages the pupil's ability to use it. The so-called English is not pleasant, I admit, but the jar of our sensibilities is fully justified by the object to be attained; and there will be no damage if it is made perfectly clear to the pupil that this exercise is not real translation. The *Report of the Classical Investigation*, Vol. I, p. 196, suggests calling it a "metaphrase" or a "construe." Real translation into idiomatic English should be rigidly demanded for the Latin of the advance lesson,³ and the difference will be plain enough. Teachers can develop and increase their own facility by reading Latin to each other.

When the class is doing this exercise well — after about three weeks perhaps — commence to vary it by reading more rapidly,

³ See *Report of the Classical Investigation*, Vol. I, pp. 201-204.

then by modifying or paraphrasing (changing person, number, tense, omitting or adding something); then vary it still further by composing and asking short Latin questions based on the Latin of the review, expecting answers in Latin rather than English wherever you can. With these variations, monotony can be avoided and the class kept on the *qui vive* while the Latin order "soaks in."

Vocabulary is fairly well provided for in the recent beginner's books, that is, there is a well-selected list of something like five hundred common words divided into sections for daily consumption and then repeated at intervals in passages set for translation. English derivatives are given, and should be given, wherever they will help fix the meanings. Nor will any good book omit the more important laws of word-formation, which increase the range of the pupil's vocabulary immensely. All the teacher has to do, therefore, is to see that these materials are applied and the words actually mastered. It is well, however, to watch the book a bit, and, in case it fails to use any word with sufficient frequency, to put that word into the sentences or questions given the class for comprehension by ear in connection with the review (see above).

A reasonable amount of time must be found without fail for reading at sight, even in the first year of Latin study. Material for this reading will be given in the beginner's book or in one of the easy readers listed in the *Report of the Classical Investigation*, Vol. I, pp. 144 ff.; and, just as soon as the pupil has made sufficient progress to attack such material, the teacher should frequently contrive to get over the assigned lesson with a little time left in which to read at sight. To do this, reduce the time spent on the review lesson by touching only the more difficult points or those that have caused trouble; or reduce the time of the advance lesson by not calling for the translation of a few of the easiest sentences when they have been well read in Latin; or, if necessary, shorten the lessons, for practice at sight will mean increased speed later on, and the lost ground will be more than made up. Let us say roughly that a total of not less than ten hours of practice in sight reading should be had in class during the first year.

It is in reading at sight that the teacher has his best chance to show the pupil how a new Latin passage should be attacked, and to lead him into the habit of attacking it rightly when he studies alone. The pupil should of course begin by reading the Latin aloud, his main effort being directed toward proper grouping of the words. His eye must run ahead in order to see the end of each group as he reads it — the point at which the next pause will be made. The reading should at first be slow, and the pauses exaggerated, to make sure that all possible meaning be grasped in each group before the next group is begun. When the pupil strikes a new word he must either be helped or be led to help himself; and it should be the latter just as far as possible. In many cases the meaning will have to be told him, but whenever it is readily suggested by the derivation of the word, or by its English equivalent, or by the context, or all of them together, he should be coached to get it by these means and not be given it directly. The effect of this coaching should be to form in him the habit of using derivation, English equivalent, and context whenever he meets a new word in the passages he attacks by himself. The more this habit becomes fixed, the fewer will be his trips to the vocabulary or lexicon. Where new syntax occurs in the sight-reading exercise, it should be explained before the pupil leaves the group of words in which it occurs.

In the early stages of Latin study it will sometimes be helpful to have a group "construed" before going on to the next one. In any case each sentence should be reread in Latin and if necessary read yet again, with the aim of putting as much expression into it as is expected in the reading of the daily prepared passage. This implies getting the full meaning of it. With practice and with growing vocabulary, facility will increase; and when the pupil is able to read a piece of Latin with proper expression the first time he tries it he is really reading.

After the beginner's book comes a continuous text. College entrance requirements no longer make it necessary to take up Caesar at once, and it is becoming more and more the custom to begin with something simpler and easier — something of the grade

given in the *Report of the Classical Investigation*, Vol. I, pp. 146-148 — which the student can learn to read at this stage with an encouraging sense of mastery, and which will form a more gradual approach to Caesar.

In taking up this text there should at first be a complete review each day of the preceding lesson, in which the class "construes" from the teacher's dictation without seeing the book — the review exercise described above. The advance lesson should then be read in Latin "with expression" and translated into idiomatic English. As there will be no more selected vocabularies, the teacher will have to make his own. Before assigning each lesson let him pick out in that lesson four or five of the most common new words and give the class the meanings of these words, at the time of assigning the lesson, with the parts needed for their inflection (nominative, genitive, and gender of nouns, principal parts of verbs, etc.), and with the English derivatives where these will assist in remembering the meanings. In order to tell what are common words, all the secondary-school teacher needs is to get a copy of the *Latin Word List* published by the College Entrance Examination Board (1927), and choose words given there. The class is saved the time required to look up these words in the vocabulary or dictionary, but is obliged to learn them thoroughly. The teacher must then make sure that they are fixed in memory, and he can do this by giving the class short Latin sentences containing them, repeating in these sentences at proper intervals those words which do not occur with sufficient frequency in the text. The sentences may be largely based on the review lesson, as indicated above. This will necessitate keeping a record of the places where each word is used, but after such a record is once made it will serve, with revision of course, for future years. The same is true of the sentences — they may be kept and revised from year to year, if desired, not composed all over again each time the course is given.

By the persistent use of this method of learning words a list of about two thousand can actually be acquired during the high-school course. The same practice can be continued with advantage

in college, and the petty drudgery involved will pay for itself many times in the increased facility and pleasure of reading.

In the continuous text, the review lesson should be handled as it was in the beginner's book. As soon as the class is "construing" well — and this should be very soon — introduce the variations mentioned above; then slowly reduce the time spent in class on the review lesson, by omitting the easier and less important parts, until nothing is left but a few short sentences or Latin questions meant to review some word or construction that requires attention. The time thus saved will go toward reading at sight. At the same time gradually reduce the time spent on the advance lesson by omitting the translation of the easier passages when they have been well read in Latin, and continue the reduction until translation is required only for passages where you suspect that the pupil may not understand what he is reading. To some extent questions on the content of a passage may take the place of translation. But the class must always realize that translation of any passage may be called for, in order to forestall bluffing; and it will very seldom be possible for the student to fool the alert teacher who has mastered the technique into thinking that he knows the meaning of a passage when he does not. Here again the time saved will go toward sight reading, and this reading should be done in that part of the text which immediately follows the advance lesson for the day. Try to reach the point where about half the period of recitation is given to reading ahead at sight.

Whenever a new type of Latin is taken up — Caesar, Cicero, Vergil, Livy — the same sliding schedule should be followed: review lesson at first fully dictated for "construing," then paraphrased or covered partially by Latin questions until the time it takes is reduced to the minimum; advance lesson at first fully read and fully translated, then the amount of translation gradually reduced as far as possible; sight translation increasing in amount as time for review and advance is curtailed; continued assignment of a small number of new words for daily mastery, with suitable periodic repetition of them in sentences made by the teacher wherever the words do not occur frequently enough in the text itself.

All this, of course, does not imply omission of the necessary grammatical, historical, aesthetic, metrical, or other explanatory comments. Such comments, however, should be restricted to what is required for the understanding and appreciation of the text in hand, and should not be made prime objects of study. One cannot do everything at once.

When a poetical text — Ovid or Vergil — is attacked, the reading should be metrical from the very start. The meter should be explained the first day, and every line should be read metrically. At first this reading will have to be mere "scansion" — regular sing-song for the purpose of mastering the fundamental movement of the verse. The next step is learning to pass without a pause from the end of one verse to the beginning of the next in cases where the sense is carried over; then learning to stop in the middle of a foot, where the sense allows, and go on again without losing the rhythm; then to emphasize the words which the sense makes emphatic, even though, as must frequently happen, this requires the introduction of a "sense" accent on a syllable metrically unaccented and the subordination of a metrical accent to this sense accent. The introduction of such sense accents is of course familiar to anybody with the slightest experience in reading good poetry. All poets "warp" the meter in this way, and thus avoid intolerably mechanical movement. Only the amount of "warping" in each verse must not be sufficient to destroy the fundamental character of the rhythm. If the verse accent is lost in one foot by subordination to the sense accent, it must be caught again later. And liberties must be rare and slight at or near the close of a verse, otherwise the normal "taste" of the verse will not be left in the mouth. The ability to "lose" the meter for the sake of the sense in one foot and recover it — that is, accent the right syllable — in the next, is the hardest thing the pupil has to cultivate when it comes to reading poetry. To cultivate it properly requires a prompt beginning on the meter and the constant progressive use of it. Expressive reading is of course the aim in poetry as well as prose, and the pupil should be led on toward it as fast as his mastery of the "scansion" will allow. He must learn to read metrically and

with the sense behind what he reads, to feel the rhythm and get the sense simultaneously. There is no other way to full appreciation of poetic literature. The pupil can accomplish this if he is started in with the meter at the very beginning, and obliged to read every line metrically with constantly increasing attempt at expression. In this way he reaches the point where it is easier for him to read the hexameter metrically than in any other way, when he need not have his attention distracted from the sense to the metrical technique, when, in other words, he can really read with enjoyment — an accomplishment the pursuit of which can be continued after he has left school or college.

This aim will require that the initial lessons be very short, because time must be had for the study of the meter and development of ability to read it. But here again increased facility and mastery will more than make up for initial loss of amount.

The review lesson should be treated just as in prose, the teacher reading and the class "construing." Of course the teacher's reading must be metrical and with expression, very slow at first, and broken with pauses for translation wherever the sense allows — and only there. In this exercise it is better to slur rather than eliminate "elided" syllables, even though the class is being taught to elide completely; and teachers will not find too great difficulty in reading the hexameter both ways. At any rate, if the teacher does read to the class with complete elision, he will frequently have to repeat the elided word after he has read it in its context, so as to let the class hear the ending. Teachers accustomed only to the analytic method will find it much more difficult to master the reading of poetry without instruction than the reading of prose, and will find it highly desirable, if not necessary, to take a course in which such instruction is given.

There are two things to be avoided — monotony and inaccuracy. We are pounding away on the Latin order and on vocabulary, so that the variety of exercise and shifting emphasis indicated above should not be neglected. We are omitting the translation of certain passages, and must be careful not to let students get the impression that they can "get by" without really

knowing the meaning of everything they read. In all cases of doubt they should be tested by being obliged either to translate or to answer questions on the content of the passage involved. But I have found no serious difficulty here, and do not anticipate any on the part of reasonably alert teachers.

It is unfortunate that the College Entrance Board Examinations cannot give oral tests, for the absence of such tests leads to the neglect of oral practice. The bad results are seen not only in Greek and Latin, but in the modern languages, which many graduates of good secondary schools pronounce very imperfectly. In schools the main business of which is to prepare for college and in which pedagogical success is measured by the proportion of students who "get through the College Boards," the teacher hesitates to take time for something not directly tested by these examinations. He is afraid the oral work may prevent him from covering the expected ground; and it is true he will have to go more slowly at the beginning of each stage of the work. Nevertheless, if he has the courage to try, he will find, as I have said, that increased speed and power will more than make up "lost" time.

I need hardly say that nearly all the elements of the method I have outlined have long been known and more or less used. What the method does is to make a definite combination of these elements. It is a method I have myself followed for a long time; and, while I am not claiming that it is the absolutely ideal way of learning to read Latin, I do believe that it is adapted to our present conditions, both in other respects and because classical teachers could swing into it without unreasonable effort. I have published it in the hope of contributing something to what I am convinced should be the supreme aim of classical study, ability to read Greek and Latin. The general accomplishment of this aim, I feel sure, is the solid foundation for the enjoyment of classical literature and for the permanence of classical education through all stages of the curriculum.

SHALL WE TEACH OUR PUPILS TO READ LATIN?

By W. L. CARR
University of Michigan

There is a story of a young man who after a very stormy courtship finally led his young lady to the altar. After the ceremony the minister, who knew something about the case, smiled sympathetically and said, "My young friends, you are now at the end of your troubles." A few weeks later the young bridegroom, obviously in mental distress, came to the minister and said, "I thought you told us we were at the end of our troubles." "I did," replied the minister, "but I didn't tell you *which* end."

In something like that situation a good many Latin teachers find themselves today. After a long pull of four years and after an enormous expenditure of time and effort in co-operative research, we teachers of Latin at last completed the work of the Classical Investigation and the results were published. We found ourselves at the end of our troubles, but the question was and is, "At which end?"

We found in the *General Report* much cause for congratulation on the place which Latin holds in the schools of the country. We found much comforting testimony to prove the reality of the hope that is within us that Latin still has, in spite of much prophecy to the contrary, an important part to play in the general education of our youth. We found an almost overwhelming list of educational objectives, stated in terms of knowledges, abilities, habits, attitudes, and appreciations, to which the study of Latin may and does under favorable conditions contribute in varying degrees.

The *Report* showed that there was pretty general agreement among teachers of Latin as to which are the more important of these ultimate objectives, and there has been a lot of clear-headed, prayerful thinking about how to improve classroom procedures

so as to enable a greater proportion of our pupils to attain these objectives and to a greater degree.

There has also been a considerable amount of prayerful thinking and clear-headed thinking about what are the more important immediate objectives in the study of Latin and their relation to one another.¹ I suspect, however, that on this point most of us are still at the front "end of our troubles." The writers of the *Report* took what I believe to be an absolutely sound position when they stated, not once but many times, that "the primary immediate objective in the study of Latin is progressive development of ability to read and understand Latin," and that the attainment of this admittedly complex ability was an indispensable means to anything like an adequate attainment of most if not all of the ultimate educational objectives of the study of Latin.

In other words, such abilities as the ability to pronounce Latin, to decline nouns, to conjugate verbs, to write Latin sentences are considered merely secondary or ancillary to the ability to read Latin; and the need for much and early experience in the actual reading of Latin is accordingly stressed throughout the *Report*. Consistent also with this point of view is the emphasis placed upon the functional as against the formal method of teaching such details as pronunciation, vocabulary, forms, and syntax.

All of which is very easily said and easily read, but not so easily put into practice, especially by teachers who were themselves taught by the grammar method and who have spent years in building up grammar habits rather than reading habits with reference to Latin.

But the recommendations in the *Report* in regard to cultivating the ability to read and understand Latin as a living language rather than to dissect it and hold a post-mortem over it after killing it go still farther. Reading Latin is insistently defined as getting the meaning from the printed page "directly and in the

¹ For some recently published articles on this general subject, see: Bill, "Reading the Classics," C. J., XXII (Nov., 1926), p. 88; Claflin, "Teaching the Comprehension of Latin," C. J., XXII (Jan., 1926), p. 276; Potter, "Training for Comprehension," C. J., XXIII (Oct., 1927), p. 16; Jeffords, "The Evolution of Latin Teaching," Sch. Rev., XXXV (Oct., 1927), p. 576.

Latin order rather than indirectly and in the English order." This startling and revolutionary doctrine is of course perfectly orthodox — as a doctrine. It is the method of attack which has been officially recommended for years and years. See, for example, the *Report of the Committee of Ten* (1893) or the latest announcement of the College Entrance Examination Board (1924), as these documents are quoted on pages 288-291 of the *Report*. The recommendations of the Board, for example, read as follows:

From the outset particular attention should be given to developing the ability to take in the meaning of each word — and so, gradually, of the whole sentence — just as it stands; the sentence should be read and understood in the order of the original, with full appreciation of the force of each word as it comes, so far as this can be known or inferred from that which has preceded, and from the form and the position of the word itself. The habit of reading in this way should be encouraged and cultivated as the best preparation for all the *translating* that the student has to do.

These Board recommendations are quoted verbatim or in substance in hundreds of courses of study and college catalogues. What makes the *Report of the Classical Investigation* seem so revolutionary to many people is the fact that the writers of the *Report* seem to have taken that doctrine seriously and to have tried to make it possible for teachers to put it into practice — which is something no committee or board had ever before attempted to do. One specific recommendation of the *Report* is that there should be a marked increase in the amount of easy made or adapted Latin to be read and a very considerable decrease in the amount of classical Latin to be "covered," particularly in the first two years. In April, 1926, the College Entrance Examination Board revised its definition of the requirement in Latin, in general accord with these recommendations, by abolishing all prescriptions and by setting up ability to read and understand new Latin as the chief goal toward which all candidates should strive, rather than the *memoriter* reproduction of what they have had drilled into them. This new requirement goes into effect in June, 1929, and it is fair to assume that colleges admitting students on

the certificate plan will soon modify their definitions of college entrance requirements in Latin in the same general direction.

Teachers of Latin in our secondary schools are therefore much freer today (or will be after next June) than they have been for a good many years to make any changes in the course of study which they believe will be of benefit to their pupils. The question of what and how much to read as well as the question of the method to be employed in teaching both the immediate and the ultimate objectives is up to them. One fundamental question which it seems to me each teacher should try to answer for himself is: "Shall I or shall I not attempt to teach my pupils to read Latin as Latin?" "If so, how and when?" "If not, what is my primary immediate objective?"

Perhaps a still more fundamental question which each teacher should ask is: "Do I myself read Latin as Latin?" "What is my own psychological reaction when I look at a page of Latin?" Of course, first of all, we all see black marks on a white page — but we know perfectly well that these are only the symbols of language and not language itself. What then is our oral response to those printed symbols? Do we say what we see or what we don't see? Do we say Latin or do we say English? Do the symbols *e-q-u-u-s m-e-u-s n-i-g-e-r e-s-t*, for example, elicit from us the oral response *equus meus niger est*, and then do we, as we say Latin, actually try to "take in the meaning of each [Latin] word — and so gradually of the whole [Latin] sentence — just as it stands," or do we more or less expertly transpose the Latin words and phrases of the sentence or clause into the usual English word-order and then more or less automatically transverbalize these transposed Latin words and phrases into their nearest English equivalents? Do we say "My horse is black" in response to the symbols given above?

To go still more deeply, do we commonly think of a Latin word or phrase as really having any meaning except by way of its nearest English equivalent? If we do, we are on our way toward reading Latin as Latin. If we do not, we are committed to a

transposition-transverbalization method. And it's no good, let me add, trying to preach one method and practice the other.

Perhaps it would be a miracle if many of us did in actual practice use anything but the transposition-transverbalization method. Almost all the classroom drills to which we ourselves were subjected as students were destined if not designed to set up and fix in us the habit of saying what we don't see, and to confirm in us the naive conception that each Latin word or phrase is just a part of a secret code the real meaning of which is revealed only to the initiated through the medium of those sacred tables of near equivalents commonly known as paradigms and lesson vocabularies.

Let me remark here that if one doesn't know whether or not he reads Latin as Latin, he can find out by a very simple experiment. Let him observe closely what he says aloud or inwardly the next time his eyes rest on a page of Latin. I suggest saying it *aloud*. I also suggest trying an unfamiliar passage, preferably a comparatively easy one.

I don't know what the majority of teachers of Latin say or do when they see a Latin sentence, but I do know what practically all my own fifth-year Latin students do when they begin their college work. They don't say Latin; they begin at once to try to decipher it, that is, to transpose and transverbalize it and to say English. And is it any wonder? Almost if not quite all the questions which they have been asked day after day for four years, the kind of responses they have been taught to expect to have to make in class, the kind of drills their teachers have employed and the kind of tests they have given, have led them *away from* rather than *toward* teaching them to read Latin as Latin and in the Latin order. It is quite as true of a foreign language as it is of the vernacular that the first step in learning to read is the association of the printed or written symbols with the sounds which these symbols directly represent. The Latin teacher's first job, therefore, if he ever expects to teach his pupils to read Latin as Latin, is to teach them, for example, to say *equus* when they see *e-q-u-u-s* and *not* to say "horse." Fortunately phonetic spelling obtains in Latin and this task is therefore comparatively simple.

•

I repeat that the habit of saying what one sees is the first step in learning any foreign language, if one is really going to *read* it. One does not need to know about or to accept all the theories of the physiological psychologist with his troupe of trained neurones to realize that he can't drill pupils persistently on one kind of response to a given stimulus and then later expect to get on demand an entirely different response to the same stimulus. We all know enough about the psychology of habit to realize that, while new stimulus-response bonds are often hard to establish, when once established they are hard to break; which, being interpreted, means that if we and our pupils devote most of the time in and out of class for a year or more to saying what we don't see instead of saying what we do see, and consequently to strengthening habits of thinking exclusively in English, and do nothing to build up habits of thinking in Latin, we needn't be surprised to find that our pupils later in the course when told to *read* Latin either have a brain storm, as Judd's study² shows that fourteen third-year pupils had, or that they "look first for the subject and translate that, etc.," as the Grise study³ shows the great majority of fourth-year Latin pupils do.

Why haven't these pupils learned to read the Latin as Latin and in the Latin order? It seems to me that there are two or three outstanding reasons why they have not. The first reason lies in the type of connected reading which until quite recently has been offered to pupils for their first reading experience. They have had to jump from a year of transverbalizing disconnected and often meaningless sentences (which are therefore practically useless for training in ability to read) to the complicated type of Latin found in the unmodified text of Caesar's *Gallic War*. A pupil without previous reading experience quite naturally finds he cannot read this sort of Latin. However with the aid of the notes, his teacher, his fellow pupils, his parents, and perhaps a juxta-

² C. H. Judd and G. T. Buswell, *Silent Reading: A Study of Various Types*, Supplementary Educational Monographs, No. 23, University of Chicago Press (1922), chapter v.

³ F. C. Grise, *Content and Method in High School Latin*, a doctor's dissertation at George Peabody College for Teachers, 1924.

linear he finds that he can more or less successfully transpose and transverbalize it. The linguistically more gifted and more persistent pupil may even learn to translate it.

2. There is another reason why pupils persist in building up habits of transposing and transverbalizing even though their teachers with equal persistence may direct them to read the Latin through and to take in the meaning of the Latin sentence in the Latin order *before translating*. The reason lies in those last two words of the directions given. Translation, not reading, is set up both in theory and practice as the real goal, and the pupil quite naturally says to himself, "Eventually — why not now?" It is my firm belief that as long as a teacher habitually uses translation into English as the chief if not the only way to test the pupil's understanding of a given sentence or paragraph his pupils will use English words and English word-order as the chief if not the only means of getting the meaning of that sentence or paragraph, no matter what the teacher tells them to do, and any preliminary "reading" of the sentence in Latin will be little more than a perfunctory pronunciation of Latin words.

3. The third reason why so few pupils have in the past learned to read and comprehend Latin as Latin is perhaps the most fundamental one, namely, the fact that most Latin teachers do not think in Latin but in English, and that the drills and notes incorporated in most Latin textbooks have been prepared by people who do not think in Latin but in English. Now since thinking in English is possible only when and if the words and phrases are in what is approximately customary English word-order, transposition of the Latin words and phrases is an essential first step toward the comprehension *as English* of any but the very simplest type of Latin sentences. *Equos nigros agricolae amant*, for example, is ambiguous (if not meaningless) if it is transverbalized without first being transposed, because English has no way except word-order to indicate the very important difference in function which exists between such Latin forms as *equi* and *equos*, nor to indicate whether in the above sentence the horses or the farmers are black.

Not many teachers or writers of textbooks in this country go so far as to give the pupil explicit directions to transpose first and then to transverbalize, such as those contained in some British schoolbooks, but the method is implicit, it seems to me, in almost all our Latin textbooks. For example, the author of one first-year book in commenting on the vagaries of Latin word-order makes the illuminating remark that "English sentences follow the *natural* order." This same author also naively reveals his inability to conceive of anyone's (even a Roman's) thinking in Latin when he says: "The [Latin] cases spelled with exactly the same letters were very hard for the ordinary Roman boy to *translate*. Some cases, like the ablative, had more than one possible *translation*."

The same point of view is implicit in such commonly used directions to pupils as "Give the meaning of *equus*" or "Give the meaning of *portabant*," especially when this latter demand is accompanied by the explanation that the *-nt* means "they," that the *-ba-* means "was" or "were," that the *porta-* means "carry" or "carrying," and furthermore that when the Romans said *Pueri portabant* they were really saying "The boys they were carrying."

Examples of this point of view could be given almost *ad infinitum* from typical classroom directions in and out of textbooks. It may be expected that pupils who begin the study of a foreign language will be at the start in very much the same provincial state of mind as was the British Tommy whom Ian Hay tells about. The "Frenchies" were only perverse in calling it *pain* when of course it was *bread*! But it seems to me that it is our business as teachers of Latin to give our pupils skilful and persistent guidance toward the attitude "When in Rome, do as the Romans do," and to develop our teaching technique accordingly.

I would urge this effort, if for no other reason, for the sake of the interest in and enthusiasm for the subject which the teacher can arouse and maintain by capitalizing the pupil's natural curiosity about how the Romans said things and by encouraging him in his natural desire to *say* things as the Romans did.

We teachers of Latin can easily name a dozen or more desirable knowledges, abilities, and habits which we believe we can cultivate

in our pupils with Latin as our instrument. What about the attitudes we are cultivating at the same time? What if our pupils while learning Latin are also learning to hate Latin as something unreal and remote from human experience? I fear that in far too many instances the pupil's budding interest in Latin as a language is killed by the teacher's interest in facts about the language; when he asks for the bread of living speech, we give him a stone of grammar and syntax.

To be specific, let us ask ourselves what aid to *learning to read Latin as Latin* a pupil is likely to discover in the methods of instruction which are commonly employed in first-year Latin classes, where from the first day to the last the classroom and home-work activities involve for the most part:

(1) Learning and drilling on the English near-equivalents of a list of Latin words.

(2) Learning and drilling on a list of Latin forms vertically arranged, with English near-equivalents for each form at the right.

(3) Learning and drilling on a series of rules of syntax, with English examples which often do not illustrate the Latin principle involved.

(4) Transposing and transverbalizing a series of Latin sentences — almost meaningless in themselves and without any discoverable connection with each other.

To ask this question is to answer it. It is true that a good many habitual reactions will result from a year's experience of this sort, but I very much fear that among those resulting habitual reactions will not be found the first and fundamental step in learning to read Latin as Latin, namely, the habit of saying what one sees; nor will there be found those habitual reactions necessary to taking the second and still more important step in reading a highly inflected language like Latin, namely the habit of grouping together on the basis of formal agreements and dependences those Latin words and phrases which belong together and which when so grouped form an intelligible thought-unit. And that is what

syn-tax means, or should mean, rather than sticking labels on ablatives and subjunctives.

And all this raises again the fundamental question, "What is language?" Is language merely black marks on a white page or white marks on a black board? Does language — even the Latin language — consist of lists of isolated words, of grammatical paradigms, of rules of syntax? Or is language — any language — a highly specialized form of human behavior designed to convey thought and to secure response? Is language — either one's own or another's — a matter of the eye only, or is it primarily a matter of the ear and the vocal apparatus and, indeed, of the whole nervous and muscular mechanism? Is it true that "when we talk we talk all over?" Is there really any such thing as "silent" or motionless reading for the normal child or adult? And to ask these questions is to answer them. Furthermore, if any or all of the implications contained in the obvious answers to the above questions are true, the teaching of any language by a purely grammatical method is fundamentally wrong and comparatively futile, if the object is to teach the ability to read the language.

Furthermore, if we really want to teach our pupils to read Latin as Latin, we must somehow free ourselves and save our pupils from the idea that Latin is a language which (like the mythical good little child) is to be seen and not heard. We must try to discover successful ways of cultivating in our pupils a genuine language attitude toward their Latin and a genuine reading attitude toward the printed Latin page. We must train our pupils to associate the printed Latin word with the spoken Latin word and to associate meaning with either. And we must train them in habits of fitting response to the spoken or written Latin word other than merely transverbalizing it into English. Vocalization in English is not the only possible form of response to speech stimulus in Latin.

Students of method will recognize that I am here advocating a kind of oral-objective-psychological-direct method rolled into one. Some have called it the conversational method, since conversation about activities or concrete objects in the room or repre-

sented by picture or in the story being read is an almost inevitable feature of the method. Some have, not without reason, called it the athletic method. I prefer calling it the reading method; but, whatever it is called, the method I am urging must be one which will provide effective devices for teaching pronunciation, vocabulary, forms, and syntax *functionally*, and one that will lead the pupil to realize that language is something used for conveying thought; that it is not merely black marks on a white page or white marks on a black board. I am urging that teachers of Latin recognize and act on the reasonable theory that much oral experience with a language must precede and accompany any fluent reading of that language, and that so-called "silent" reading of a foreign language can be safely attempted only after much training in oral reading.

And the fluent reciting of paradigms or word-lists is not, according to my definition, oral experience with the language; nor is the perfunctory pronunciation of the words of a Latin sentence as a mere preliminary to a translation of the sentence. Most teachers and pupils rightly consider this sort of thing just a waste of time and energy. Furthermore, halting or even fluent translation into English is not an oral experience with the language being translated. The usual type of "translation English" may not be bad for the pupil's English (though it certainly can't be good for it), but translation into English good or bad as the habitual response to a Latin word or sentence is undoubtedly bad for the pupil's Latin. I am pleading, therefore, for a more intelligent and a more determined effort to develop a teaching technique which will train pupils to read *Latin as Latin* and not as English, good or bad. And in order to accomplish this, I am pleading for the selection and organization of reading content, especially in the first two years, that will make this method possible. And I am pleading for all this because I believe that by this method we can better accomplish our ostensible immediate objective in the teaching of Latin, and at the same time make Latin a much more effective instrument for the attainment of those lasting educational objectives which are or should be the ultimate goal of all our classroom activities.

WHAT PRICE METHOD?

By DORRANCE S. WHITE
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Before one should attempt to state why he prefers the translation to the reading, or direct, method, he should consider carefully several important points. It is well to remember that the ultimate goal of all education is good mental and moral behavior. In preparation for this the good of the child, not our preference in teaching, should be the consideration of paramount importance. Some stress syntax, as the writer did for ten of his twenty years of teaching, because they, like him, enjoy teaching it. Others insist that pupils shall rate high in antiquities and spend whole periods dressing classes in togas, and they assign hours of home work for boys on bridge-building and the drawing of Roman battle plans. Some of etymological bent chase classes through the dictionary. Others have been known to make lists of Latin mottoes and idioms a minimum requirement. Many cannot forbear to overload a class with composition, and there are those who will even hold endless debate over whether Caesar put four or forty gates in his camps. So each rides his hobby as his inclination bids. Translation, comprehension, pronunciation, composition, syntax, antiquities, etymology, historical background, both secular and religious, geography, these are surely not of equal importance. They will not each function to the same degree in preparing the child to develop into an efficient social being. From them, rather, must be made a properly balanced diet; and, as will be presently shown, what may be stressed in one method cannot so well be stressed in the other.

The results of the classical investigation created a decided current of pessimism among those nearest to the machinery of the survey. Defects and inadequacies were brought to the surface which made their faces blanch. There is much in the *General Report* which reflects this pessimism. But the impression seems to be

gaining headway that the disappointment over the results was due to a misapprehension as to what constituted a proper norm of achievement in translation from Latin to English. It is true that what we saw done by pupils in the lower quartile group was far from encouraging. The writer personally scored several thousand of the Henmon tests by the partial-credit method and knows that pupils wrote stuff that bore not the remotest likeness to logical English. But in the same tests, and in others of connected Latin, a good proportion wrote the sort of English that easily proves our contention that Latin study is functioning in the perfecting of English expression and that translation can be made accurate and elegant even when literally done. For as charity workers in the city slums sometimes feel that the world has gone to the dogs, so do we feel about the Latin situation when we are told that pupils ought to achieve certain excellence in their translative effort. For example, in the pages of questionnaires that engaged the attention of teachers were questions that implied methods that looked exceedingly good. Many teachers were led, even as the writer, to check certain procedures which they believed were sensible and which they on the spot had persuaded themselves that they were following. Here are certain desirable results. Do we get them? No. Pupils make the following atrocious mistakes. Do yours? Yes, they do. O woe! Everything is out of joint! And we then conclude that our method must have gone to seed and should be scrapped. If somebody happens along with the proposition to try the reading method, with gusto we fall upon it and declare that we will try anything else than what we have been using, not once and now, but forever!

But before we reach too avidly toward a new method in our desire to believe that it holds the open sesame which the old did not possess, it might be instructive to note that educationalists have agreed generally that the study of Latin nets the pupil high intellectual value and that this agreement has been based on results obtained from training in the translation method. Thus C. O. Davis¹ determines the intellectual value of a subject in the extent

¹ *Our Evolving High School Curriculum* (1927), p. 142.

to which it develops some fourteen skills, habits, and abilities: observation, attention, perception, analysis, comparison, discrimination, imagination, conception, association, judgment, reason, memory, expression in oral, written, and graphic forms, resourcefulness. Defenders of the translation method would be in complete unanimity that among these items their method is distinctly superior in training the pupil's power of *discrimination*, which means the ability to select essentials, *imagination*, or the ability to construct mental pictures, *reason*, or ability to formulate a series of connected judgments, *expression in oral and written forms*, and *resourcefulness*, or the power to meet a situation and adapt means to ends; and at the same time it equals, if not surpasses, the oral method in every one of the remaining nine points.

It is true that educationalists have not been so willing to grant the study of Latin a high place in social values. But they will some day, in a burst of intellectual honesty, admit that foreign language study yields both intellectual and social values to the highest degree. We ourselves feel sure that the study of Latin in the third and fourth years particularly possesses high social values. It behooves us, then, not to adopt a method which shall rob us of this high place. For where with the reading method, admittedly a slower procedure, would a teacher find time to stress properly these social values?

It may be said safely that but few teachers know what the reading method is. They best know what it is who have tried to start again, via the translation method, a pupil who has had some training in the reading method. Briefly, it consists in pronouncing the sentence and getting the idea without concern for the exact and elegant English equivalent. That the teacher may ascertain whether the pupil has the idea or not, he quizzes said pupil with such Latin interrogations as his powers and that of the pupil may command. Commendable attention is given, in such time as is left, to antiquities, historical allusions, derivational drill, and all the rest of the rich background that classical studies afford. The passage is regularly picked to pieces, just as one who had a penchant for dismembering a literary cadaver might dissect a poem of Tenny-

son or Heine. The writer visited a college Latin class in which the pupils, largely through the guidance of the instructor, pulled a beautiful poem of Catullus limb from limb in precisely this manner! The slogan of this method is, "Let the pupil learn to read Latin as Latin." That means, as one of the chief proponents illustrates, if a pupil finds himself confronted with the sentence, *Equus meus est niger*, he is not to think, even, far less say, "My horse is black," but *equus meus est niger* — *equi, equi, equi*, rather than horses, horses, horses. He must not think "*meus equus*," but plain "*equus meus*." In other words, he must know his Latin as Latin, not as its equivalent in English.

Most teachers believe that the translation method is both natural and logical. In a questionnaire sent out during the investigation, teachers were asked to indicate which of the following procedures they preferred:

1. Pupils should grasp the meaning of the entire sentence in the Latin order and then translate the sentence as a whole.
2. Pupils should take in the thought of each word-group as it appears and then translate it.
3. Pupils should read a Latin sentence and then answer questions upon it without translating it.

The *General Report* says (p. 109) that ninety-six per cent of the teachers who put pen to the questionnaire preferred the order given above, which means that they almost unanimously favored the translation method. And in the judgment of the writer, if the reading method had not been stated in exact words, but left to the teachers to formulate, if they so chanced to think of it, that method would have run a very poor chance of a place on the list.

With regard to any one of these three procedures, why should we ask a pupil to advance to the attack on a sentence in a line of battle different from our own? The teachers in this first group stand before their classes and exclaim, "Now pronounce this sentence slowly and drink in the thought as you proceed, letting the ideas come without concern for their English order; then arrange the whole in a good translation." Theoretically that is beautiful. Oh that it might be done! But we teachers ourselves do not pro-

ceed that way. We think that we do. We tell our pupils that we do. But we adopt that procedure only with Latin over which we have been traveling these many years. It is not at all strange that we should be able to read Latin as Latin when it is a part of our very consciousness. But how do we proceed when we are face to face with new material? We glance rapidly over the whole sentence, snatching the subject with a modifier or two, then the part which gives us the main action, and then we fill in the rest of the sentence as our knowledge of syntax and recognition of forms enable us to do with speed. Our pupils could do equally well with our equipment. And our main task in the teaching of Latin is to give them that equipment in degree. They will not follow it as we have for a score of years. They will stay with it two years, perhaps four. How much Latin skill can we teach the average pupil in two or in four years? That is the challenge. There can be no waste of time. But we must not be insincere exponents of an unnatural art. We should not ask our pupils to think in Latin while we pursue the thought in English!

Opponents of the translation method accuse us of permitting pupils to try to translate before they have encompassed the thought of the sentence. Hence the grotesquely absurd renderings in English. No one will deny that for a clear-cut translation complete comprehension is necessary. But while the pupil cannot hope to perfect the translation of a sentence until he has absolute assurance of its meaning, we will all surely agree that the effort to translate helps greatly to clarify the meaning. The writer had an opportunity to observe this when at the close of the investigation he made a detailed study of the scores on comprehension obtained from the Ullman-Kirby Comprehension Test (Form 2) compared with partial-credit scores obtained from the translation of the same paragraphs, and found the high correlation coefficient of .97. The pupil should be taught to recognize as quickly as he can the subject, then the predicate. There is absolutely nothing pedagogically or scientifically wrong in this. Then let him start anew and wrestle each modifier into its proper place, until he has determined which thought-units should have precedence when he goes

over the sentence for the last time. This process involves at least three attempts at the sentence, and I would make it a point to stress this feature in translation. From the very first week of the first year of Latin study the pupil should be trained not to drop a sentence until it makes a clear-cut, sensible-sounding translation.

✓ It were much better for him to translate the sentence absolutely wrong than to have the meaning right in a hodge-podge of English. For, in the writer's opinion, the most vicious result that must inevitably come about from the reading method is that the pupil will develop the habit of slipshod thinking. If, indeed, as advocates of the reading method criticize, pupils trained by the translation method express in faulty English translation based upon imperfectly formed comprehension of the Latin idea, what may be said in favor of a method which entails the danger of an equally faulty comprehension not expressed in English at all?

It is altogether unreasonable, as Professor Potter has shown,² to expect a pupil to keep in mind the various thought-units of a sentence which covers a third of a page in the manner recommended by Dr. Hale in his *Art of Reading Latin*, which the Committee for the Classical Investigation considered of sufficient importance to occupy three and one-half pages of their *Report* (pp. 291-294). The process is decidedly unnatural. Take for an example the comparatively short sentence in the second chapter of the second Catilinarian: *Quem quidem ego hostem, Quirites, quam vehementer foris esse timendum putem, licet hinc intellegatis, quod etiam illud moleste fero, quod ex urbe parum comitatus exierit*. Applying Hale's formula, what chance has the pupil, reading this sentence at the opening of the third year, of divining the relationship between the *quem . . . hostem*, subject of *esse timendum*, and the same, now resolved into a nominative, the understood subject of the *quod . . . exierit* causal clause, unless he mechanically endeavors, by trial and error, to place the elements of that terrible sentence in logical English order? Especially if he has been spending his time for the most part during the first two years opening and shutting windows in Latin? And how is

² CLASSICAL JOURNAL, October, 1927.

the teacher, within a reasonable length of time, going to decipher the reaction of the pupil to the proper understanding of the meaning of the sentence? He must not translate. Shall he tell the teacher in his own words what the passage means? But of what value is that if he may have obtained the meaning from a "pony" or from a classmate five minutes before he came to class, or from those fine italics so conveniently placed at the top of each paragraph of Latin? Shall the teacher feel justified in spending a whole period quizzing the pupil in oral Latin on five or ten lines of matter? Could some teachers themselves comprehend the sentence and command quick reaction if they had never seen the sentence before? How much more effort, then, must be made by the pupil who is suffering the embarrassment of appearing before two audiences at once, his teacher and his classmates! The fact of the matter is that we may group our words in Latin perfectly, but the thought will not come unless there is a rapid, conscious, deliberate relating of the various parts of the sentence, in the process of which there is a subconscious recognition of the inflectional forms and syntax, and a directly conscious effort to fasten together the phrases which appear so broken and so unnatural with a tool sharpened only for the logic of English thought. To repeat, I get my best results when I encourage my pupils to seize upon subject and predicate with as great speed as they can command; then let them proceed from the first to build up the sentence as they go along, translating as the related parts appear to their consciousness. The sentence then is naturally in violation of good English order. I consider this the crucial point and request the pupil, when preparing his lesson, to translate through his lesson twice aloud, *in good English*, before presuming to take my time and that of the class in recitation. I do not always get this, but my pupils know that that is what I want, and that is the standard by which their standing as Latin students is judged in my classroom.

✓ There are at least four obstacles which, in the writer's judgment, stand in the way of successful achievement by the reading method. The method requires too much time, the aims are too

indefinite, pupils have to be above the average in mental ability, and few teachers are mentally and linguistically equipped for such a method. Enough has already been said about the tremendous waste of time when the poorly prepared teacher tries to formulate questions in rather doubtful Latin and the pupil tries to transpose those questions in his mind and give answer in even more doubtful Latin. It is true that when pupils have memorized previously stated questions and answers, the recitation, under the leadership of an alert teacher, assumes the appearance of most commendable interest and liveliness. But are memorized phrases, questions, and answers an exercise in language practice designed to exercise mental and linguistic powers? Granted that accurate and fluent pronunciation of Latin is a desirable accomplishment, will the fact that the pupil will never be called upon to exercise that accomplishment justify pursuing this process throughout the pupil's course to the exclusion of the practice in the use of his English through the translation method? Is there sound pedagogical argument to justify the use of the reading method if it takes three seconds to ask a question in English involving one simple idea and three minutes to ask the same question and get a reaction from the pupil via the medium of Latin?

As to definiteness of aim, if proponents of the reading method rule out the translation of a moderately difficult Latin sentence into good English as an objective, can they make the study of Latin an excuse for the study of derivatives, classical antiquities, history, etc.? Will they attempt to reach objectives which students of English or history can reach quite as well? And as for the pupil's mental qualifications, one of the most capable and enthusiastic supporters of the reading, or direct, method confessed some six years ago before a conference of Latin teachers that no appreciable degree of success could be expected unless the method were used with a class above the average in ability. But this seems to be in direct violation of the principles of democratic education and is going only part way in the task of training for good citizenship. And as for the mental and linguistic equipment of teachers, it has appeared to me from an observation of the reading method

over a period of seven years that the teacher, in order to achieve results comparable with those of the translation method, must talk twice as much, twice as fast, be four times more wide-awake, and expend, one would judge, ten times as much energy. This naturally makes a more impressive recitation, but the burden and the laurels rest on the shoulders and brow of the teacher. And there are not many teachers who have this gift or can stand the pace. Judicious injections of this tonic are an important element with which to remove the clogging carbon from a lethargic class. But how many teachers are willing to keep all day long on their mental and physical tip-toes, with fagless minds alert, matching one mind with thirty restless minds of pupils mouthing meaningless Latin phrases and all the time thinking in English? The price of the method is too great to pay in needless expenditure of time and energy.

We all want for our classroom the best method that a thousand years of Latin teaching can bring to our hand. But I, for one, hold to the translation method today because I believe that it best shows me what a pupil knows about his lesson. I believe that it does not waste time and that it is definite in aim. I believe that through it the background of syntax, political, secular, and religious history, mythology, geography, and proper English usage can best be served. I believe that it best subserves that most important by-product of Latin study, the improvement of spoken and written English. I believe that when done properly, without too great concern to cover too wide a territory, it affords the pupil a greater amount of satisfaction for the amount of effort expended. For the pupil who will travel with us only two years, it means a glimpse at another civilization, equipment in better English, more accurate habits, better mental and moral behavior. For the pupil of four years and more, it means an opportunity for us to make of him a social and civic leader of truest character. For it matters less how glibly he may chatter *Marce Tulli, quid agis?* than that he shall become a self-examining student who in his later life shall put the question to his mind and heart each day, "American Citizen, what are you doing?"

Then why teach Latin?

A FIFTEENTH-CENTURY GUIDE TO LATIN CON- VERSATION FOR UNIVERSITY STUDENTS ¹

By LILLIAN GAY BERRY
Indiana University

Zarncke in his *Die deutschen Universitäten im Mittelalter* reprints the complete text of a fifteenth-century student handbook ² which he places among the most important sources of information on student life of the period under consideration. Since the publication of Zarncke's work, ³ other authors of researches ⁴ along the line of medieval education, in their effort to re-create the life of the universities of Europe in the late middle ages, acknowledge their indebtedness to this handbook as the earliest and best original source, unique in its kind, for many and interesting phases of academic life. In addition to the mine of information that it contains on studies and students of medieval times, this manual has much worthy of consideration, not only in view of the present trend toward a study of various kinds of medieval Latin literature, both good and bad, but especially as throwing much light on student use of Latin as the language of daily life in the period when Latin was the language of learning and of the learned.

¹ Read at the Annual Meeting of the Classical Association of the Middle West and South, Ann Arbor, Michigan, April 14-16, 1927.

² *Manuale Scholarium Qui Studentium Universitates Aggredi ac Postea in Eis Proficere Instituunt.*

³ Leipzig, Weigel, 1857.

⁴ Robert Francis Seybolt, *Manuale Scholarium*, Harvard University Press, 1921, in the Introduction to his translation, pp. 9-13, cites a number of works in which reference is made to the *Manuale*. Dr. Seybolt's rendition of the *Manuale* is the first translation of this work into any modern language. The purpose and spirit of this effort is well summed up in his own words: "To preserve, in some measure, the atmosphere of the University setting, and the adolescent spirit of the dramatis personae, as well as to cope with the problem of the bad Latin and the etymological vagaries of an unknown author. . . ."

The examples cited in the notes of this article are typical of the poor Latinity of the *Manuale*.

The author of the *Manuale Scholarium* is unknown. Zarncke⁵ adduces evidence to show that the original was published between 1476 and 1481 at Ulm by Dinckmut and that the life pictured is that of Heidelberg University.

The purpose of the work corresponds to that of present-day student handbooks issued for the purpose of making smoother the path of the entering student. The plan and contents form a pleasant bit of documentary evidence attesting the fact that the *sine qua non* for a fifteenth-century student was very different from that of a student of the twentieth century. Everything suggests that the dominant idea of the publication is to give the new student a fair amount of conversational Latin adapted to meet the various situations which he is likely to encounter in the course of his daily activities in town and gown. The entering student doubtless did receive from this book much gratuitous information on regulations and conditions that he might meet, but this knowledge was incidental to that of the first and fundamental requirement of grammar schools⁶ and colleges of this period — that the students speak Latin at all times in school and in the lodgings.⁷

The need of a guide to Latin conversation had long been felt. The teacher of today thinks that he has a hard task in struggling against a thousand distracting influences, none of which faced the master whose pupils had never heard of a football game, basketball tournament, picture show, airplane, motor car, the Charleston, and other allurements of the present-day world, flesh, and the devil. However, the teacher of the good old days had his troubles too. The fact that Latin was the language of the school as well as the language of learning made it imperative that the master teach the children to speak Latin and to comprehend spoken Latin. As early as 1005 Aelfric, Archbishop of Canter-

⁵ Friedrich Zarncke, *Die deutschen Universitäten im Mittelalter*, pp. 224-25.

⁶ *English Grammar Schools in the Reign of Elizabeth*, p. 142, Columbia University Contributions to Education.

⁷ Zarncke, *op. cit.*, p. 183, *Libellus Formularis*, lines 26-29: *Latinitatem quoque tam in collegiis quam bursis inter loquendum continuo observare student. Sub poena impeditiois ac non promotionis tempore suo.*

bury, attempted some colloquies,⁸ the purpose of which may be seen in a sample of the conversation. It begins on the part of the pupil as follows: "Oh, master, we children ask you to teach us to speak correctly, for we are unlearned and speak corruptly." From this time on writers of schoolbooks made an effort to adapt Latin to the requirements of the thought of a given period through the introduction of the dialogue form of instruction. The most conspicuous and popular of these attempts were the *Colloquies* of Erasmus, consisting of seventy-nine conversations along educational lines. These were intended to serve as models of good colloquial Latin. When Montaigne at the age of six started to the Collège de Guyenne at Bordeaux, he could speak only Latin. He must have been an exception to the rule, if one may judge from the statutes of various schools which made the speaking of Latin obligatory upon all students. At Erfurt even the one in charge of student lodgings had to take an oath to guide those under his care in the speaking of Latin.

The conversation book called *Manuale Scholarium* contains eighteen chapters; of these, seventeen are in the form of Latin conversations. The first one is between one of the masters and a new student desirous of matriculating in the university.⁹ The remaining sixteen are between two students, Camillus and Bartoldus, on various matters pertaining to their studies and pastimes. The last chapter serves the purpose of a polite letter-writer, with models of invitations¹⁰ to breakfasts and banquets given by students to masters at the time of taking the bachelor's degree or on less festive occasions when an examination was imminent.

⁸ *Colloquium ad pueros linguae Latinae locutione exercendos.*

⁹ Zarncke, *op. cit.*, p. 3, *Man. Schol.*, lines 1-4: *Discipulus. Reverende magister, reverentiam vestram oratam facio, adiumento mihi sit, ut in matriculam almae huius universitatis intituler et a beatio absolvi queam; nam proxime adveni, ignotus sum et ad quem confugerem praeter vos habeo neminem.* Lines 10-11: *Magister. Cur huc advenisti, expone mihi.* *Discipulus. Studii causa.*

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 47, *Man. Schol.*, lines 24-27: *Reverende magister, faciamus reverentiam vestram oratam, quatenus magistri N. collationis officium accipere non recusetis, et nostri in disputatione memor fueritis et omni tempore in vestris beneplacitis erimus studiosissimi.*

One entire chapter is given to the rough initiation of the *beanus*, or entering student.¹¹ This is the oldest record of this officially sanctioned type of hazing. A study of the contents of the remaining chapters discloses the fact that the subjects of conversation did not greatly differ in tone and character from the student talk of today. There is the same concern as to lectures and exercises¹² required for the bachelor's degree as there is at the present time about credits and courses prescribed for graduation. There are the same complaints¹³ from students who find attendance at class a weariness to the flesh. The usual praise¹⁴ and criticism¹⁵ is bestowed upon their instructors. Talk about reviews¹⁶ and examinations forms as large a part of the conversation as it does today: "What reviews shall we hear?" "Some

¹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 4-10, *Man. Schol.*

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 10, *Man. Schol.*, lines 25-32: Camillus. *Mi Bartolde, scis tu, quot lectiones ad baccalaureatus gradum et exercitia complere oportuerit?* Bartoldus. *Optime scio, nam lectiones sunt novem, exercitia sunt sex.* Camillus. *Et quo pacto complentur, scisne?* Bartoldus. *Quidni? nam tripartitae sunt et lectiones et exercitia. Itaque in tribus mutationibus [quas] integre complere poterit, id est in spacio unius anni cum dimidio.*

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 11, *Man. Schol.*, lines 7-10: *Sed audi, unum est quod abs te scire volo; nam ferunt, si in principio ac fine lectionum fuerimus, sat esse pro completionem, et, si voluerimus, medio tempore ter quaterve intrabimus.* Lines 15-17: Bartoldus. *Erras vehementer, nam facultatis artium magistri ita instituerunt, ut quemquam, priusquam admittatur, affirmare oportet iuramento, qualiter audiverit, quotiescunque neglexerit.* Lines 24-27: Camillus. *Certe grave est, ut ita dixerim, molestumque semper adesse; timeo me non facturum.* Bartoldus. *Cupis promoveri, non posses subterfugere.* Camillus. *Dicam me affuisse.*

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 12, *Man. Schol.*, lines 10-12: *Nam si quippiam magister noster resumeret, certe non negligere, est enim facundus persuasivus: quasi res ageretur mihi a parietibus, cum aliquid in apertum ducit.* Lines 24-25: Camillus. *Hunc magistrum tu quasi ad coelum attulisti, tamen modernus est.*

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 30, *Man. Schol.*, lines 10-16: Camillus. *Eram in lectione, non unicum didicissem verbum. Nos praeceptores nostri cogunt, tempus hoc frustra consumimus.* Bartoldus. *Unde hoc evenit? Arbitror, te non advertere, aut enarra, quale sit impedimentum.* Camillus. *Id enim est obstaculum, quia nimis alta gravisque materia est. Potius eam exponerem pecuniam et non intrarem, interea quid facerem, quod mihi foret utilitati.*

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 12, *Man. Schol.*, line 6: *Ceterum quas audiemus resumptiones?* Lines 8-10: *Quam plurimi sunt, quibus visum est maiorem assequi scolares utilitatem in resumptionibus quam aut nancisci in lectionibus aut exercitiis.*

think we get more from reviews than lectures and exercises." The idle and gay Camillus, fearing a deserved failure at the end of his course and the consequent refusal¹⁷ on the part of his parents to send him any more money, is encouraged by his friend, who tells¹⁸ him that his teacher is only trying to scare him, that there will be much more unprepared ones than himself come up for examination, and finally that the masters will not fail to react properly to a gift of several florins. Then the delinquent, who has not even enrolled in some of the lectures and has slept¹⁹ through others, decides to spend on a banquet,²⁰ in honor of his master, twenty-two florins, some of which he plans to exact from his parents on the ground of the high cost of living. Among other questions discussed, all of which have a modern sound, are living expenses,²¹ borrowing money,²² books, and clothing,²³ approved lodgings,²⁴ the pros²⁵ and cons²⁶ of being a grind. The rules of

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 26, *Man. Schol.*, lines 15-17; Camillus. *Habeo litteras a parentibus, e quibus intelligo, nisi me submittam examini, nullum amplius ab ipsis habeam praesidium. Angor me torquet atque metus exagitat.*

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 26, *Man. Schol.*, lines 25-30: Bartoldus. *Consule magistrum tuum. Is noscit, quid faciendum fugiendumque fuerit in hac re. Camillus. Ipsum consului. Dissuadet; parum, inquit, me sapere. Bartoldus. Scio conditiones eius. Nam timorem tibi incutere existimat. Certe non est necesse, ut tantopere timeas. In manifesto est, multo indoctiores fore in examine. P. 27, lines 6-10: Audi verbum unum; spero tibi esse profuturum. Habundans enim possis examinatore facere honores reverentiasque. Nostro aevo multum faciunt munera; tribus quatuorve florenis omnium tibi favorem comparabis.*

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 25, *Man. Schol.*, lines 30-31: *non tam celer fuisses ad magistrum ac dixisses me obdormivisse.*

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 27, *Man. Schol.*, lines 26-28: *faciam collationem unam, invitaboque magistros, quos offenderim unquam aut re aut verbis; ipsos quoque tractabo lautissime. Spero me sic obtenturum favorem eorum.*

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 45, *Man. Schol.*, lines 10-11: Camillus. *Quid dices de sumptibus? quo in precio habentur comestibilia?*

²² *Ibid.*, p. 33, *Man. Schol.*, lines 19-21: Camillus. *Equidem in memoria habes, Bartolde, quam parato animo tibi pecuniam crediderim? Tu pollicitus es, eam in brevi tempore restituere. Non facis. Mihi grave est.*

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 24, *Man. Schol.*, lines 29-30: *Quociens, oro, rebus meis et libris usus es et vestibus veluti tuis?*

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 21, *Man. Schol.*, lines 14-15: *extra locum probatum stare non licet.*

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 46, *Man. Schol.*, lines 8-11: *At, ut tibi clare exponam, vidi pauperes quosdam famulatibus aggravatos, nonnunquam plus ceteris in disciplinis*

the university come in for their full share of discussion and criticism. It is surprising to learn that the problem of proper dress²⁷ for the young men engaged the attention of the fifteenth-century deans and proctors of Heidelberg: "I have been called before the dean, and he thinks he will extort a fine from me." "Why did he summon you?" "Because I wear a stomacher, an openwork collar, and pleated shirt, as if I were the only one who wears them!" "I know, but it is against the rule to wear them." A similar prohibition is found in the statute²⁸ of Leipzig forbidding students to go about *in habitu inhonesto seu indecenti*. Two chapters are given over to a discussion²⁹ of the fair sex. The argument engaged in concerning the methods of the nominalists and realists³⁰ affords interesting information from an original source on the struggle between these two schools of philosophy. The debate³¹ on the worth of the schools of poetry and of law reflects the spirit of the war waged by followers of juristic and philosophic lore upon the study of poetry, which the old school regarded as a waste of time.

That the author of the *Manuale* based his colloquies upon real themes of conversation is to be seen in the statutes that have come down from various schools of this period. A Leipzig collection³² of regulations of the year 1490 contains records of official actions along the line of practically all subjects discussed in the *Manuale*.

hauserunt et in eruditissimos creverunt viros. Sed hi multum laboraverunt, ceteris dormientibus fuerunt in studio.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 17, *Man. Schol.*, lines 26-28: *nam ab acutissimis audiui viris saepissime, ingentes labores studentibus non esse adiucandos, sub quibus fessi corruant.* P. 46, lines 2-4: *Etenim, ut de me faciam coniecturam, parum in disciplinis nanciscerer, nisi frequentia quadam essem coniunctus.*

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 30, *Man. Schol.*, lines 29-30; p. 31, lines 1-2.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 166, *Libellus Formularis*, lines 19-24: *vestibus videlicet non cinctis, aut tunica vel pallio lateraliter aperto, nimia brevitare notatis, aut strictis manicis usque ad scapulas sive cubitum semi-apertis, collario cancellato vel in dorsum nimis exciso aut parte anteriori totaliter aperto, pectorali effoeminato, pileo laicali, caputiolo petiato aut calceis rostratis sive diversorum colorum.*

²⁹ *Ibid.*, *Man. Schol.*, chapters xiv and xv.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, *Man. Schol.*, chapter vii.

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 15, *Man. Schol.*, lines 11-31; p. 16, lines 1-20.

³² *Ibid.*, *Libellus Formularis Universitatis Lipsiensis*.

The residents of the average university community of the present day would be interested in some of the rules by which authorities then attempted to inhibit the youthful spirit of the students. Among the many things made subjects of legislation, the following were forbidden: wandering about at night with loud shouting⁸³ and dissonant singing, braying like donkeys, neglecting to pay board bills, cruelly hazing freshmen, playing for money on the campus or behind the Church of Saint John, destroying the property of citizens, and other college pranks not yet obsolete.

However, no other statute seemed to be the source of so much annoyance as the one requiring the students to speak Latin. Not only were wolves, *lupi*, appointed to take down and hand in the names of violators of this rule, but other students were required to report⁸⁴ the offenders. In a student quarrel⁸⁵ one says: "There's another thing that gives me great displeasure. As soon as I, without thinking, break into the vulgar tongue, you straightway report me." To this the other student replies: "You have not been summoned. You know that it is the rule that one report another for speaking in the vulgar tongue." "Yes," replies the first one, "but it is very hard — I may almost say annoying — not to use the vulgar speech." In the chapter in which several university statutes are discussed, the following conversation occurs:

Bartoldus. What disturbs you?

Camillus. Listen, I pray. I have been before the wolf twelve times. . . .

Bart. Who was he?

Cam. I do not know. . . . I will avenge this wrong.

Bart. It is not a wrong, instead it's the rule. Don't be surprised that you have been reported so often. You might have been reported

⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. 176, *Libellus Formularis*, lines 26-27: *vel clamores horribiles more onagrorum nocturnis temporibus excitet.*

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 25, *Man. Schol.*, lines 34-36: *Camillus. Aliud est etiam, in quo magnam habeo displicentiam. Quamprimum in verbum aliquod prorumpo vulgare omni absque deliberatione, e vestigio me signas. P. 26, lines 1-3: Etenim noris, commune hoc esse statutum, alter ut alterum signat pro sermone vulgariter prolato.*

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 28, *Man. Schol.*, lines 7-24.

a hundred times. As a matter of fact, to tell the truth, I have not heard one Latin word from you in eight whole days.

The next sentence shows that the *beani*, or entering students, were in need of some guide for help in their use of everyday Latin: "Since we do so I should not see any difference between ourselves and the *beani* if some means were not used to bring it about." The inadequacy of the Latin repertoire of the *beanus* is again referred to in the initiation scene. One of the two youths plaguing the newly arrived student says that he, the freshman, will report ³⁶ back home that the upperclassmen "use such wonderful Latin that I do not know what they mean." The freshman is taunted with, "You do not speak Latin, you just stutter."

These bits of evidence point to the conclusion that it was facility in the use of Latin that the fifteenth-century student at Heidelberg was in need of much more than the information, instructive and interesting as it is, concerning academic conditions. As a matter of fact, the preponderance of evidence from other sources is to the effect that satisfactory results were not attained in the attempt to use Latin instead of the native tongue. This may afford some comfort to present-day teachers who have tried to use the direct method with far from soul-satisfying results. Erasmus attributed the failure to achieve success in the Latin teaching of his time to slavish imitation of Cicero, which he ridiculed so successfully in his *Ciceronianus*, whose hero thinks it divine to speak like Cicero and will not corrupt his style by speaking one word on an everyday subject. Some few may have approximated this Ciceronian divinity, but the rank and file of students is probably best described ³⁷ by Spondeus.

In fact, children were expected to have some knowledge of spoken Latin when they entered grammar school, where they started on a formidable array of Latin authors. An idea of the

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 6, *Man. Schol.*, lines 27-28.

³⁷ John Brinsley, *Ludus Literarius*: "I have labored and striven by ferule and all means of severity, yet have not beene able to make my schollars utter their minds in any tolerable manner, or on ordinary things, but in very barbarous phrase; not so much as to put it into practice among themselves; much lesse to utter their minds in Latin easily, purely and freely."

Latin required, according to the curricula³⁸ of English, French, and German schools of the period, may be gained from a general outline of Sturm's famous school at Strassburg. At the age of seven the child learned the declensions and conjugations; at eight he continued grammar with inflection of all forms, learned many Latin words, read much simple Latin, and memorized words and phrases; at nine he began on the letters of Cicero; at ten he continued Cicero's letters, commenced a Latin dictionary, read the distichs of Cato, learned the Latin catechism, formulated rules of syntax based upon Cicero, and had exercises twice daily in style; at eleven he read the longer letters of Cicero, the *Andria* of Terence, selections from Aesop, Ambrose, Martial, Horace, enlarged his store of common words, and strove for still greater proficiency in grammar; at twelve he read Cicero's *Cato Major* and *Laelius*, completed his dictionary of common words, had exercises in eloquence and style, and studied meter and mythology; at thirteen he continued his daily drill and practice in writing, read some of the Verrine orations, the *Adelphi* of Terence, the *Satires* and *Epistles* of Horace, and studied Greek grammar and the Pauline epistles; at fourteen he read the third book of Cicero's *Ad Familiares*, the sixth book of Vergil's *Aeneid*, and Lucian's *Menippus*; he also found time to study rhetoric, to turn Greek orations and the *Odes* of Pindar into Latin, Horace into Greek, and to read and act out the comedies of Plautus and Terence!

Doubtless the author of the *Manuale Scholarium* had gone through a similar course of severe training. Yet in writing a guide to the Latin conversation necessary to express himself properly in various university activities, the author's Latin is in many instances as poor as that of any freshman of today.

It is not the purpose of the writer to enumerate with schoolmaster's glee all deviations from Ciceronian standards to be found in the *Manuale*. A few will suffice to show that the author very often nodded. He used the subjunctive and indicative indiscriminately, with no attempt to distinguish between the difference in feeling between these two moods. The perfect subjunc-

³⁸ Ellwood P. Cubberley, *Readings in the History of Education*, pp. 210-12.

tive³⁹ is very frequently used for the perfect indicative. The indicative and subjunctive stand side by side in parallel constructions.⁴⁰ Indirect questions⁴¹ sometimes have the verb in the subjunctive and again in the indicative. Statements of fact⁴² in the direct discourse are expressed in the indirect by *ut*, *quia*, and *quod* clauses. Result clauses⁴³ are introduced by *quod*. *Quod* and *quia* clauses giving the reason of the speaker⁴⁴ have verbs in the subjunctive; a verb of fearing is followed by a *quod* clause in the indicative.⁴⁵ Tenses violate the sequence⁴⁶ required by the thought. The same page often affords instances of the same idea expressed in one instance in good Latin, and in the next sentence in very bad.

The careless Latinity of the whole work suggests that the writer had no reason to fear that in his dreams the Angel of the Lord might appear to him as he did to St. Jerome and upbraid

³⁹ Zarncke, *op. cit.*, p. 44, *Man. Schol.*, line 30: *Nempe a pluribus audiverim*. P. 7, line 2: *Ha, quid dixerim?* P. 8, line 13: *Quo fecerim dentale?* P. 24, line 17: *Hercle, non occultaverim*. P. 28, line 10: *Obsecro, animadverte: duodecies fuerim in lupo*. P. 28, lines 20-21: *Unicum a te latino sermone verbum . . . audiverim*. P. 33, line 12: *Tociens ego audiverim*.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 30, *Man. Schol.*, line 10: *Eram in lectione, non unicum didicissem verbum*. P. 34, lines 13-14: *parcitatem tuam semper ostendis, nec eam abdere possis*. P. 43, line 18: *Ibimus ad ecclesiam atque adiamus sermonem*.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 6, *Man. Schol.*, lines 27-28: *et loquunt tam mirabilem latinum, quod ego nescio quid est*. P. 29, line 9: *Non credis, quam infensi nobis sunt theologi*. P. 31, line 7: *Nostra non interest diiudicare, quid ipse facit*.

⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 5, *Man. Schol.*, lines 18-19: *censeo equidem, eundem in minutissimas partes distraheret*. P. 29, line 2: *aestimabam, ut tam stricte statuta illa vellent*. P. 31, line 27: *creditu, quod resistere valeant*. P. 39, line 19: *Video bene, quod anulus est*. P. 40, line 21: *Cogita, quia haec inhonesta est*. P. 42, lines 14-15: *Nosco enim, quod factiosus es*.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 33, *Man. Schol.*, lines 12-13: *Tociens ego audiverim quod taedium amplius audiendi conceperim*. P. 43, line 15: *Illo sermone facis quod non conspicas*.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 11, *Man. Schol.*, lines 4-5: *Scio equidem quod a baccalaureis plurimis, qui optime norunt, audiverim*. P. 16, line 31: *Non dissuadeo quia ipsam crebro commendare audiverim*.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 26, *Man. Schol.*, line 19: *Timeo, quod non promovebor*.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 31, *Man. Schol.*, line 9: *Videbo, si quas fingere valerem evasiones*. P. 42, lines 15-16: *Ego autem maiorem amplecti cupio discretionem quam verberibus pugnarem*.

him with belonging to Cicero, so far removed from classical standards is the greater part of the text. Zarncke, with good reason, suggests that the author was more absorbed in campus — to use a college catchword — “activities,” which he describes so sympathetically, than he was in the real work of the university. From the purpose of the book, it might be conjectured that such a book was written by someone connected with the college, a master or dean who frequently had occasion to realize the students’ limitations in expressing himself in Latin; but the tone and adolescent spirit of the whole, as well as the many instances of poor Latin, suggest that the author was nearer the rank of a student than that of an official. In colleges today some student organizations are said to keep in their archives, for the benefit of the new *fratres*, lists of old class exercises, often very inaccurate; so this booklet may be the work of some student philanthropist. Or is it possible that, although Heidelberg in 1480 had no school of business, some student of an enterprising spirit saw a need, and profited by the preparation for the college trade of this ready-made set of Latin conversations? Numerous editions of it published in the next two centuries show that it ranked in the class of the best sellers of that period.

That the fifteenth-century student of Latin found difficulty in mastering the fundamentals of Latin should not be a matter of surprise when one stops to consider our own success in teaching our vernacular. Our students, who are born and reared in homes where English is spoken, take courses in English throughout the grades, high school, and even college, without achieving elegance, precision, or even accuracy of speech.

THE EGYPT OF THE GREEK ROMANCES

By E. MARION SMITH
Hollins College

Heliodorus is simply giving utterance to a well-attested fact when he puts into the mouth of the Egyptian priest Calasiris, then a resident of Delphi, the following words: "Various subjects were discussed; sometimes the manner of our religious rites in Egypt, and why certain animals were counted sacred more than others; and the different histories which belonged to each. Another inquired about the construction of the pyramids and the catacombs. In short, there was nothing relative to Egypt which they did not scrutinize into; for it is wonderful how the Greeks listen to, and are delighted with, accounts of that country."¹

Without a doubt Egypt did possess a strong fascination for the ancient Greeks. Herodotus, who is known to have travelled there, felt its spell, and in spite of the fact that he opens his second book, which he devotes exclusively to Egypt, with the expedition of Cambyses into that country, he is much less concerned with the fortunes of that expedition than with the recounting of all the marvelous stories he had collected in that strange and ancient land, its superstitions and gods, its curious animals, the Nile on which its life depends. And Strabo, who likewise had visited the country, connects with it many legends as fabulous as the prototype of the modern Cinderella story.²

For the less-traveled Greeks Egypt may have held an even

¹ *Aethiopica* ii. 27, Smith's translation (London, 1889), p. 53. From the earliest times Egypt was looked upon as a land filled with wonders. See the description of Thebes, *Iliad* ix. 381 ff.: ". . . Egyptian Thebes, where numerous possessions were laid up in the mansions, and where are one hundred gates, from each of which rush out two hundred men with horses and chariots" (Buckley's translation, p. 162).

² Strabo xvii. 808. Here Strabo tells the story that once when Rhodopis, the Greek courtesan, was bathing, an eagle snatched one of her sandals from the hands of her female attendant and bore it away to Memphis, where the

greater fascination. Euripides perhaps felt something of its glamor when, at the very opening of the *Helen*, he caused his heroine to utter these words: "These indeed are the fair virgin-streams of the Nile, which, in the place of heaven-sent showers, water the plain of Egypt, when the white snow melts [over] the fields."³ And throughout the play Egypt is a land filled with uncivilized people, whose king exacts the lives of whatever Grecian strangers reach his shores. To such writers Egypt was a vast unexplored region,⁴ a land of mystery, where almost any adventure might take place, and whence might emanate marvelous stories of almost any description. And this enchantment lasted through the ages. As late as the third or fourth century of the Christian Era Egypt appealed to the Syrian Heliodorus, the author of the *Aethiopica*, as a land especially suitable as a setting for romantic adventures; and Achilles Tatius, emulating Heliodorus no doubt, as much as a century later, Alexandrian though he was, saw in Egypt the same possibilities for the background of the exploits of his own Leucippe and Clitophon; while Xenophon of Ephesus⁵ made use of it in the story of the love of Anthia and Abrocomas. In short, it became a favorite device of the late writers of Greek romance to set the lovers' adventures there.

The Greek Romances have been criticized for being less valuable than they might have been because they give too much attention to adventure and too little to manners and character.⁶ We king (Psammetichus) was administering justice in the open air. There, flying over his head, the eagle let the sandal fall into the king's lap. The king, surprised at the strange happening and at the shape and beauty of the sandal, sent throughout the whole country to find the owner. She was found in Naukratis, and the king made her his wife, and at her death she was buried in a pyramid.

³ Euripides, Buckley's translation, Vol. II, p. 199.

⁴ Cf. Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* viii. 6. 20 f., where the author explains that the extreme parts of Egypt and Ethiopia are uninhabitable, some from heat, some from cold, some from too great abundance of water, some from scarcity of it.

⁵ The date of Xenophon of Ephesus has not been satisfactorily determined: Locella, one of his editors, places him in the time of the Antonines; Peerlkamp, another editor, believes that he is the oldest of the writers of Greek romance; while others go so far as to consider him an imitator of Achilles Tatius and of Heliodorus and date him as late as the 5th or 6th century.

⁶ Dunlop, *History of Fiction* (London, 1896), p. 90.

must admit, I think, that it is hardly their purpose to be too explicit in regard to these matters, and yet a student of ancient Egypt can scarcely refrain from wishing that the authors of these fabulous tales, once they had taken the pains to mention Egypt as their background, had considered it worth their while, in a few vivid strokes at least, to heighten their effect by giving their readers a more clearly delineated conception of that country. But they mention Egypt mainly by way of giving their romances an atmosphere of reality. It is all too like the way in which the Hellenes, before the rationalizing tendency in religion set in, were prone to assign the activities of their gods to perfectly definite localities in the Greek world, simply to give the stories about these gods a semblance of possibility. By mentioning Egypt the authors of these romances succeed in some measure in establishing the desired impression of actuality, and, having done this, they allow their fancies to play freely about this background, which is sufficiently vague to permit them to develop their miraculous stories. Egypt, to these writers, is a land infested with pirates and beset by robbers and savages, and one almost feels that none but a most prosaic person would consider approaching it except after shipwreck.

Mingled with these exaggerated accounts, however, are scattered realistic touches. Heliodorus, for example, makes it quite plain that his romance is supposed to take place before the age of Alexander the Great, while Egypt was tributary to the Persian monarchs,⁷ but he does very little in the way of characterizing his period. There does appear, though, to be a standing Persian army,⁸ which is at the beck and call of the satrap, Oroondates. Achilles Tatius,⁹ on the other hand, vaguely mentions an army of considerable size, stationed in the Delta and about Heliopolis. Possibly these soldiers are the successors of the armies of Psammetichus I, Necho, Psammetichus II, and Amasis.¹⁰ We find

⁷ Cf. "Early Greek Romances — The Ethiopics of Heliodorus," *Blackwood's Magazine*, CCCXXXIII, p. 112.

⁸ *Aethiopica* ix. 6.

⁹ iii. 24.

¹⁰ The ruler of the land is referred to by Xenophon of Ephesus under the Greek title of ἀρχων. Cf. *Erotici Scriptores Graeci* i. 373. 11; 374. 15, etc.

Greeks serving as interpreters,¹¹ a thing which is not at all unlikely, since, from the seventh century onward, the Greeks came to Egypt, both as mercenary soldiers and as residents, in fairly large numbers. There are a few references to religion, and it is Isis who here appears as the outstanding deity of the whole Egyptian Pantheon. But Achilles Tatius does mention a "holy statue of Zeus of Mount Casius,"¹² at Pelusium, which he describes at considerable length; and he also discusses in some detail a festival of Serapis, who, he carefully explains, is the equivalent of the Greek Zeus.¹³ There is very little information to be gathered regarding Egyptian customs.

The impressions of geography which the reader gets are extremely interesting. Here there is evident superficiality, for, while many cities are visited in the course of the wanderings of these lovers, they are, for the most part, cities of wide renown, such as Thebes, Memphis, Elephantine, Syene, Pelusium, and Naukratis. It is deplorable too that they are briefly dismissed without more effort at description on the part of the author. Thebes, for example, receives little more than the epithet "celebrated";¹⁴ Naukratis¹⁵ is mentioned only incidentally as the home of the merchant Nausicles who figures in the *Aethiopica* of Heliodorus; Memphis¹⁶ is called into use simply as the goal of the fleeing Calasiris and Chariclea, or the native city of Thyamis, the pirate captain; while Pelusium is referred to by Xenophon of Ephesus merely as τῆς Αἰγύπτου πόλιν,¹⁷ and the statue of Zeus of Mount Casius there engrosses Achilles Tatius far more than does the city itself.¹⁸ Achilles Tatius, however, does do better in the case of his description of Alexandria, but we must remember, of course, that he was a native of that city. His first mention¹⁹ of it is brief, as he dis-

¹¹ *Aethiopica* i. 7.

¹² iii. 6.

¹³ v. 2 f.

¹⁴ Heliodorus *Aethiopica* ii. 25 and vii. 28.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, ii. 8.

¹⁶ Heliodorus *Aethiopica* i. 18 and vii. 2.

¹⁷ *Erotici Scriptores Graeci* (Teubner) i. 369. 20.

¹⁸ Achilles Tatius iii. 6.

¹⁹ ii. 31.

misses it with the words τὴν μεγάλην τοῦ Νεῖλου πόλιν, "the great city at the mouth of the Nile"; but later on,²⁰ when his lovers actually arrive there, he indulges in a fairly long and very beautiful picture of the place. He speaks through his hero:

After a voyage lasting for three days, we arrived at Alexandria. I entered it by the Sun Gate, as it is called, and was instantly struck by the splendid beauty of the city, which filled my eyes with delight. From the Sun Gate to the Moon Gate — these are the guardian divinities of the entrances — led a straight double row of columns, about the middle of which lies the open part of the town, and in it so many streets that walking in them you would fancy yourself abroad while still at home. Going a few hundred yards farther, I came to the quarter called after Alexander, where I saw a second town; the splendor of this was cut into squares, for there was a row of columns intersected by another as long at right angles. I tried to cast my eyes down every street, but my gaze was still unsatisfied, and I could not grasp all the beauty of the spot at once; some parts I saw, some I was on the point of seeing, some I earnestly desired to see, some I could not pass by; that which I actually saw kept my gaze fixed, while that which I expected to see would drag it on to the next. I explored therefore every street, and at last, my vision unsatisfied, exclaimed in weariness, "Ah, my eyes, we are beaten." Two things struck me as especially strange and extraordinary — it was impossible to decide which was the greatest, the size of the place or its beauty, the city itself or its inhabitants; for the former was larger than a continent, the latter outnumbered a whole nation. Looking at the city, I doubted whether any race of men could ever fill it; looking at the inhabitants, I wondered whether any city could ever be found large enough to hold them all. The balance seemed exactly even.²¹

It is a description for which we are grateful, and we can only wish that a similar thing might have been done for Thebes and Memphis.

But it is the presiding genius of the place, the mysterious Nile with its flamingoes²² and hippopotami²³ and crocodiles,²⁴ which

²⁰ v. 1.

²¹ Loeb translation.

²² Heliodorus *Aethiopica* vi. 3: . . . Νεῖλῳ φαινικόπτερον.

²³ Achilles Tatius iv. 2.

²⁴ Heliodorus *Aethiopica* vi. 1.

truly fascinates and holds these writers of romance. The reader feels its influence at the very opening of the *Aethiopica*, as the story begins at the Heracleotic mouth of the Nile, which is called by Herodotus²⁵ the Bucolic mouth. Sojourners in Egypt travel on the Nile by boat, for so Leucippe and Clitophon, after they have suffered shipwreck, set out from Pelusium for Alexandria, their original destination.²⁶ There are in the romances passages descriptive of the Nile, for the most part highly didactic, which seem to re-echo the descriptions of the Greek historians and geographers. Compare, for instance, the description of the Nile Delta which Achilles Tatius²⁷ gives his readers with that presented by Herodotus.²⁸ There is great similarity. Also the age-old question concerning the causes of the inundation of the mysterious river is raised once more in the romances.²⁹ Methods of restraining the river by dykes are referred to,³⁰ and the excellence of its water as a drink is discussed.³¹ These are passages that we welcome, even though we may feel that, according to our better judgment, they are a bit heavy in their setting and impede the progress of the narrative. But there are lighter passages, descriptions of processions and festivals on the Nile and the following beautifully descriptive passage of the river itself from Achilles Tatius:

This great Nile is the centre of their existence — their river, their land, their sea, their lake; it is a strange sight to see close together the boat and the hoe and the plough, the rudder and the winnowing-fan — the meeting-place of sailors and husbandmen, of fishes and oxen. Where you have sailed, there you sow; where you sow, there is a sea subject to tillage. For the river has its due seasons, and the Egyptian sits and waits for it, counting the days. Nor does the Nile ever deceive; it is a river that keeps its appointments both in the times of its increase and the amount of water that it brings, a river that never allows itself to be convicted of being unpunctual. You may

²⁵ ii. 17.

²⁶ Achilles Tatius iii. 9.

²⁷ iv. 11.

²⁸ ii. 17.

²⁹ Heliodorus *Aethiopica* ii. 28.

³⁰ Achilles Tatius iv. 14.

³¹ *Ibid.*, iv. 18.

see a conflict between river and land: each struggles with the other, the water to make a sea of so wide an expanse of soil, and the soil to absorb so much fresh water. In the end it is a drawn battle, and neither of the two parties can be said to suffer defeat, for water and land are coextensive and identical.³²

Such then is the impression of Egypt which these ancient writers of romance give us. It will readily be seen that it is by no means a complete picture — the elements in it are diffuse and scattered. It is only a background, hastily sketched in, made up of things drawn from the most general knowledge of Egypt — and yet it is a background such as served the purposes of their stories.

³² iv. 12 (Loeb translation).

Notes

[All contributions in the form of notes for this department should be sent direct to John A. Scott, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.]

ON CAVALRY CHARGES WITH BRIDLELESS HORSES

In the second edition of Colonel George T. Denison's *History of Cavalry from the Earliest Times*, p. 58, there occurs the following paragraph with regard to cavalry charges with bridleless horses:

"Livy, Book iv, chap. 33, in the account of the battle between the Romans under the Dictator Mamerus Aemilius and the Fidenae (*sic*), tells an extraordinary story of the Roman Master of Horse, Aulus Cornelius, introducing a new mode of fighting among the cavalry, by commanding his men to take the bridles off their horses, and leading them to the charge with unbridled steeds. Livy states that the plan was crowned with success. If this story has any truth in it, it is evident that Aulus Cornelius determined there should be no hesitation, but that the charge should be pushed home. It is a curious circumstance in this connection that General Hood, of the army of the late Confederate States of America, has always maintained that if the reins of the cavalry could be cut at the moment of the charge, the horses would break down the opposition of any infantry, and that the charge would always be successful."

In a similar charge against the Samnites in 325 B.C. the Roman cavalry gained a signal victory, according to Livy (viii. 30. 6.), but far better confirmation of General Hood's theory is to be found in Livy's description (xl. 40) of a battle between the Romans and Celtiberians in 180 B.C. The account is more dependable, since the event occurred so much nearer Livy's own time, and also more significant, because the opposing force was more determined and, presumably, greatly outnumbered the Romans and their allies.

In the battle the Celtiberians attacked the Romans with conspicuous bravery but found themselves, when fighting in a regular line, no match for the experienced legionaries. They then resorted to the

wedge, a formation which regularly broke the part of the line opposed to it. On this occasion too their opponents were thrown into disorder and their line all but shattered. Hereupon the Roman commander, Fulvius Flaccus, rode up to his cavalry and told them to attack the wedge. "You will do this more effectively," said he, "if you will let your horses rush upon them unbridled, a thing which tradition says Roman horsemen have often done with great glory to themselves." The horsemen removed the bridles from their mounts, and making a headlong charge, broke the wedge and dispersed it.

It will be recalled that the brilliant Numidian cavalry were accustomed to ride without bridles. This habit is generally mentioned by ancient historians out of admiration for their horsemanship, but their effectiveness was increased by it. In the Roman campaign against the Ligures in 193 B.C., the Numidian allies seemed unimpressive for many reasons, one of which was that they had horses without bridles, but when they applied the spurs in battle they forced their way through their enemy (Livy xxxv. 11. 10-11).

Military history shows that many ideas derived from the ancients have been put into practical application in recent centuries, but it would probably be very hard to find another example in which an independent theory of a modern soldier has been so clearly demonstrated in ancient practice.

EUGENE S. McCARTNEY

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

VERGIL *GEORGICS* III. 498 ff.

Labitur infelix studiorum atque immemor herbae
Victor equus fontisque avertitur et pede terram
Crebra ferit.

In translating these lines, it is usually forgotten that *infelix* is a favorite expression of Vergil and that it regularly fits into his artistic pattern in a well-defined, distinctive manner. In sixty out of the sixty-seven appearances of the word in Vergil, it begins the first or second foot, more frequently the second; and, when the latter is true, there is almost invariably a natural pause in the line immediately after the word *infelix*. But in the face of this practice most editors (followed by the translators) construe *infelix* with *studiorum*, thus removing the pause that one expects after *infelix* in the middle

of the third foot, and causing besides no little trouble for the commentator. It would seem that a glance at lines such as *Aen.* v. 328 ff.:

levi cum sanguine Nisus
labitur infelix, caesis ut forte iuvenis
fusus humum viridisque super madefecerat herbas,

ought to suggest the way these same two words *labitur infelix* are set off logically and grammatically in *Geor.* iii. 498, especially since *studiorum* goes very naturally and easily with *immemor*. The frequent occurrence of similar lines leaves little room for doubt in the matter. Just a few typical examples:

Aen. ix. 477: *Evolat infelix et femineo ululatu.*

Aen. xii. 641 f.: *Occidit infelix, ne nostrum dedecus Ufens
aspiceret.*

Aen. vii. 308 ff.: *Ast ego, magna Iovis coniunx, nil linquere inausum
quae potui infelix, quae memet in omnia verti,
vincor ab Aenea.*

Aen. xi. 85: *Ducitur infelix aevo confectus Acoetes.*

Aen. x. 781 f.: *Sternitur infelix alieno vulnere caelumque
aspicit.*

In the last two examples, despite the grammatical relation that *infelix* bears to *Acoetes* and *sternitur* to *alieno vulnere*, there is a decided dramatic pause after *infelix*.

Even when a verb does not begin the verse, the same pattern and purpose in the use of *infelix* can easily be recognized:

Ecl. vi. 47: *A! virgo infelix, quae te dementia cepit!*

Ecl. vi. 52: *A! virgo infelix, tu nunc in montibus erras.*

Aen. i. 712: *Praecipue infelix, pesti devota futurae.*

Aen. vii. 376: *tum vero infelix, ingentibus excita monstis.*

Aen. ix. 390: *Euryale infelix, qua te regione reliqui?*

Aen. x. 849 f.: *Heu, nunc misero mihi demum
exitium infelix, nunc alte volnus adactum!*

But the rôle that *infelix* always plays, no matter what its construction in the sentence may be, is that of expressing a passionate exclamation of sympathy for that one whose ill fate is either prophesied or actually recounted. And those who take *infelix* with *studiorum* not only lose all the dramatic and tender poetical force of the epithet but also are compelled to give it a use and construction which does not elsewhere appear in Vergil. *Infelix*, in other words, is never construed with the genitive, or for that matter with any other (dependent) case. Its syntactical connection with the sentence is merely that

of agreeing grammatically with some substantive. *Infelix animi* (*Aen.* iv. 529) is cited sometimes, but a more careful examination of the verse will show (as some of the editors point out) that *animi* is locative and in reality modifies the verb (i.e., the idea of *finding rest* or *soothing cares*) understood from the preceding verses (522-25).

The word *atque*, moreover, implies a logical correlation between the expressions connected, a correlation, however, which cannot be found if *infelix studiorum* is to have the meaning ("unhappy after all his noble deeds"; "gaining nothing from his pursuits, and the victories he has won"; "in his strivings baffled") which some of the editors have laboriously evolved for it. Vergil could not be guilty of using *atque* to connect concepts so unrelated as *infelix studiorum* and *immemor herbae*. At all events he does know how to correlate in a logical manner, as in *Aen.* i. 475:

infelix puer atque impar congressus Achilli.

Or again in *Aen.* ii. 772:

infelix simulacrum atque ipsius umbra Creusae.

If on the other hand the words *studiorum atque immemor herbae* go together, *studiorum* and *herbae* are joined by *atque* without difficulty of any kind. *Studiorum immemor*, in fact, calls to mind the words *veterumque oblitus honorum* of Ovid (*Met.* vii. 542) in what is obviously an imitation of the passage under discussion. For this same grouping of words there is also the statement of Servius: *quidam volunt ideo dictum "studiorum atque immemor herbae," quod antiqui in pratis certamina exhibere consueverant*, although it must be perfectly clear that the correlation of *studiorum* and *herbae* need not depend on the argument he here advances. It seems more natural to give *studia* the meaning it ordinarily has, that of *desires* or *interests*, which of course would include *cursus*, *herba*, etc. Then *atque* would be following its usual practice of introducing "some particular or detail illustrative of a general word."

Many editors and translators, however, instead of regarding the steed as *infelix* because he sinks (*labitur*) a prey to disease, just as Nisus was styled *infelix* because he falls (*labitur*) a loser in the race, apparently prefer to consider him *infelix* "as having been cut off from further triumphs." This in spite of the fact that Vergil nowhere else finds it necessary to qualify *infelix* in any way. It is never said

of some subordinate incident, but always of the chief event that Vergil for the moment has under consideration. It regularly presages doom for the character, or even the thing, which elicits the author's sympathy. In a word, *infelix*, which to a linguist means little more than *unhappy*, to a poet or a reader of poetical sensibilities will always be in the lines of Vergil an exclamation of deepest, heartfelt pity.

Verses 498-99, it is needless to add, should be read:

Labitur infelix, studiorum atque immemor herbae,
victor equus.

HOMER F. REBERT

AMHERST COLLEGE

HERODOTUS AND BENJAMIN FRANKLIN

In describing the morals and the customs of the Persians in Book i. 138, Herodotus says: "They regard lying as the most disgraceful thing in the world and next to lying they place running in debt. They have many reasons for this hatred of debts, but the chief reason is their belief that the man who owes money will at some time be compelled to speak lies."

Poor Richard in his *Almanac* for July, 1741, made this observation: "Lying rides upon debt's back." This is identical with the notion of the Persians.

For August, 1748, he had this variation: "The second Vice is Lying; the first is running in Debt."

It seems hard to believe that Poor Richard was not in some way influenced here by Herodotus.

JOHN A. SCOTT

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

Hints for Teachers

[Edited by Victor D. Hill, Ohio University, Athens, Ohio. It is the aim of this department to furnish teachers of high-school Latin with material which will be of direct and immediate help in the classroom. Teachers are requested to send to the editor of the department short paragraphs dealing with matters of content, teaching devices, methods, and materials which they have found helpful. Questions regarding teaching problems are also invited. Replies to these will be published in this department if they seem to be of general interest; otherwise they will, so far as possible, be answered by mail. It will, in general, be the policy of this department to publish all such contributions as seem of value and general interest.]

Improving the Preparation for College Latin

This inquiry comes from a capable teacher of high-school Latin in a good city system. For the suggestions given in reply we are indebted to Professor S. E. Stout, of Indiana University.

Question.—“Please present through Hints for Teachers some points which might be stressed in high-school Latin so as to improve the ability of students in the first year of Latin in college. It would be of value to the teachers in the secondary schools if there could be some suggestions of needed emphasis as evidenced by weakness found in college freshmen.”

I have been asked to point out some of the defects which college Latin teachers find in freshman Latin students that could be remedied in part by better teaching in high-school Latin classes. I wish to say first that I have from experience a vivid conception of the difficulty and complexity of the high-school Latin teacher's task. I have nothing but admiration and praise for the patience, courage, devotion, and skill with which so many good teachers give themselves to this difficult work. The criticisms I shall make are chargeable against college teachers of Latin to as great an extent as against their colleagues in the high school. They are some of the points which I keep in mind in trying to improve my own teaching. I mention them here because I think they are points which high-school teachers may profitably consider in trying to improve their work.

The most poorly prepared entrants into college freshman Latin classes know one meaning of about three hundred Latin words, can by careful search of memory, if given a little time, locate most of the forms found in the text, and have a hazy notion of the more com-

mon Latin syntactical relations. Thus equipped, with a dictionary, a copiously annotated text, a patient and not too exacting teacher, by working overtime on their assignments, they can guess their way through the freshman year well enough to make a bare pass. They cannot hope to succeed in the college Latin course as a whole.

Of the better-prepared students, many show inadequate training in vocabulary. Those whose teachers have required them to master the two thousand most important Latin words as given in Lodge's list are a splendid minority. But they are more numerous than those who have formed the habit of trying to infer the meaning of new words or the new meaning of known words from their component elements and from the context. The majority even of good students turn to the dictionary too soon, with no thought that they might see the meaning without its help; and when a suitable meaning has been found they hasten on with the translation without reflecting on the relation between the meaning and the elements that form the word. Most study of etymology in Latin classes is unsystematic and spasmodic. It is extraneous to the course, not a tool and an aid in it. It has not been directed upon words *in situ* in the connected Latin read, to help to infer their meaning or to clarify and enrich comprehension and appreciation of the meaning. Nor have review and summary and comparison classified the knowledge gained in word-study to make it function in interpreting new text in Latin or in English. Rarely is attention called to a most fruitful phase of word-study, how words take on new meanings. Most of such growth in meaning can be explained by the Laws of Association, so often repeated by rote in psychology. The study of the extension of meaning of words not only provides a cue in the search for the appropriate English word to be used in translation, with its constant discipline of good taste, but it gives the key to the meaning of figurative language, an insurmountable barrier for many students to the reading and enjoyment of literature.

Latin students often know the declensional endings by rote without having developed a quick and sure reaction to them. They fail to feel the force of case, voice, mood, and tense at once when the word form comes under their eye, even though as a separate exercise apart from reading they can locate the form and translate it. This causes great waste of time in preparing lessons, and fosters the habit of guessing where clarity and certainty should be found.

Students rarely have developed a feeling for the unity of phrase and clause groups. They are likely to feel this in short prepositional phrases, but not so likely in participial and appositional phrases and in clauses. The habit of suspense, of waiting for the construction to be resumed when it has been broken off by a subordinate element, has not usually been acquired. Teachers do not ask frequently enough what the connectives connect. If more Latin were read aloud with proper grouping and emphasis after it has been clearly understood, this feeling for the unity of phrase and clause groups would be better developed. This would make the reading of new Latin much more easy.

A serious defect in college freshmen in Latin is that they have so little knowledge of ancient history and institutions, of the social organization and the daily life of which a Roman was a part. No Latin author can be read with understanding, much less with appreciation and pleasure, except as this background can be filled in. It is to be filled in for the most part by the complete interpretation of the Latin that is read day by day, but this interpretation is neglected in too many schools. Many of the students leave Cicero without knowing the simplest facts about *consul*, *praetor*, tribune of the people, a meeting of the senate, a *contio*, the *comitia*, the courts. Most of them pass from the class in Caesar without visualizing the situation when they see the word *agmen* or *acies*, *insidiae*, *obsidio*, *oppugnatio*, or *expugnatio*; and they think of the barbarian Gauls as they think of the Indians from whom our fathers took the land that is our home. Too many of them have been taught by teachers who own no classical dictionary, whose students are not encouraged to raise troublesome questions outside the field of syntax. It is difficult to bring students from such schools to a challenging and insistent attitude in which they will not be satisfied until they clearly and fully understand what they read and have thought something about its implications.

Latin Songs — The Musical Scale

These two interesting items were contributed by Miss E. Camilla Sperati, Waverly High School, Waverly, Iowa. Her presentation of the second item serves to emphasize also the existence in convenient form of information concerning Greek and Roman music which may be used advantageously in the classroom or in Latin club programs. It will be found desirable to consult several of the works cited, and

all are of such a nature as to be readily available as a part of the public-school music teacher's equipment.

I

A Holiday Song.—My pupils take a keen delight in discovering Latin in their other classes. Recently the juniors brought from Washington Irving's sketch "The Stagecoach" an old holiday school song. The words are readily adaptable to "Jingle Bells." We changed the vulgar Latin forms *tempua* and *absque* to *tempus* and *sine*.

Omne bene
Sine poena
Tempua est ludendi.
Venit hora
Absque mora
Libros deponendi.

II

The Musical Scale.—Another interesting discovery was that the syllables *do, re, mi*, etc., used in reading the scale come from Latin. Guido of Arezzo (995-1050 A.D.) found in an old hymn to John the Baptist that the first note of each measure was one tone higher than the first note of the preceding measure. By writing the notes in sequence and giving to each one the Latin syllable sung on that note he derived the system of *Sol-fa* singing used today. There were seven measures which corresponded to the seven-tone scale. The words of the hymn follow:

Ut queant laxis (*Ut* later changed to *do*)
Re- sonare fibris (*re*)
Mi-ra gestorum (*mi*)
Fa-muli tuorum (*fa*)
Sol-ve polluti (*sol*)
La-bii reatum (*la*)
Sancte *Iohannes* (*si*)

Ut was evidently changed to *do* for the sake of euphony. The syllable of the seventh tone (*si*—later changed to *ti*) was derived from the initial letters of St. John's name. When the eight-tone scale was developed the last was named from the first. With a little harmonizing the hymn could very easily be used. For the music or for a further discussion of the facts see any reliable history of music. The following are suggested:

Cook, James Francis. *Standard History of Music*. Philadelphia: Theo. Presser Co.

Gehrkins, Karl W. *Music Notations and Terminology*. Chicago: Laidlaw Bros.

Hamilton, Clarence G. *Outline of Music History*. Chicago: Oliver Ditson Co.

Faulkner, Anne Shaw. *What we Hear in Music*. Camden, N. J.: The Victor Co.

Special Program — An Hour with the Muses

This was contributed by Miss Essie Hill, Senior High School, Little Rock, Arkansas.

This is an outline of a program we staged before our high-school assembly under the title "An Hour with the Muses." Its effectiveness is seen from the following statements culled from local city papers.

"One of the finest arguments for a classical education that we have seen in many years was presented by the Latin department of the Little Rock High School at the Friday morning assembly. It is probable that few students left the auditorium at the close of the hour's program without a keener interest in the work of the department and a greater understanding of the place of Latin in the curriculum. . . . According to prevalent student opinion, it was one of the most beautiful acts given here recently."

Prelude — *Arma Virumque Cano* — Girls' Chorus

Clio, Muse of History — "Narratio" — By a student

Polyhymnia, Muse of Sacred Song — Paper by a student

"Ave Maria" — Flute, violin, and piano

Melpomene, Muse of Tragedy — A student

Reading — "The Death of Hector" (Homer's *Iliad*)

Erato, Muse of Love Songs — A student

Bullae ("I'm Forever Blowing Bubbles") and *Quod Omnes Te Amant*

("Because They All Love You") — Girls' Chorus.

Thalia, Muse of Comedy — A student

Colloquium — "What's the Use?" (CLASSICAL JOURNAL, XX; November, 1924)

Euterpe, Muse of Harmony and Lyric Poetry — A student

Serenade — "Sing, Smile, Slumber" (Gounod) — Clarinet, violin, and piano

Urania, Muse of Astronomy — A student

Mica, Mica, Parva Stella — Solo

Terpsichore, Muse of the Dance — A student

Group Dance — "Greek Maidens Playing Ball" (by Louis Chaliff, Russian School of Dancing, New York City)

Calliope, Muse of Epic Poetry — A student

Reading — The First Thirty-three Lines of Vergil's *Aeneid*

Postlude — *Te Cano Patria* — Audience, led by Girls' Chorus

Book Reviews

Lucian, Satirist and Artist. By FRANCIS G. ALLINSON. (Our Debt to Greece and Rome Series). New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1927. Pp. ix + 204. \$1.75.

Professor Allinson has long been known as a student and lover of Lucian, and those who have used his admirable book of selections are not surprised that he has succeeded so well in giving a readable account of Lucian's works and influence in the brief space of this monograph.

The first chapter is devoted to a concise summary of Lucian's attainments, the second to a description of the age of the Antonines with special emphasis on the literary setting. The third chapter gives an account of Lucian's life, and the fourth is devoted to his writings, their form and content. The fifth chapter deals with philosophy and ethics. Perhaps Lucian's failure to comprehend some of the philosophical doctrines is taken a bit too seriously, and it is certainly futile to try to assign such a cynic consistently to any school. Lucian's attitude toward the supernatural is treated in the sixth chapter, and those dialogues that deal with the dead and the marvelous are here rather fully analyzed. The synopses are excellent. In dealing with supposed imitations of the New Testament (page 94) it might have been well to mention the similarity between the all-golden city on the Islands of the Blessed and the New Jerusalem of Revelations. Chapter seven completes the survey of Lucian's works with "Other Dramatic Dialogues, Polemics, Narrations." These chapters occupy one hundred and twenty pages. The next ten are given to analyzing Lucian's sources, including his sources in art. The last chapter includes these ten pages and fifty-seven more devoted to Lucian's Legatees.

Professor Allinson has done well to assign so small a proportion of his admirable volume to the legatees. It is a difficult task to trace an author's influence down the ages and do justice to it and not at the same time reduce the narrative to a mere catalogue without value and without interest. In my judgment the volumes in this series are more valuable for their concise and interesting presentation of the

author's work than for the collection of the names of authors who subsequently made use of that work. Professor Allinson has shown admirable restraint in not summarizing the twenty thousand pages of dialogues of the dead published in monthly installments over twenty-two years by Fassman of Leipzig (p. 172).

Professor Allinson's treatment of Lucian's references to art seems to me admirable. I might specially mention the "Dance of Death" (p. 132 and the frontispiece).

Due acknowledgment is made to Gildersleeve by dedicating the volume to his memory and by frequent references to his familiar essay, which, in my opinion, is "the law and the prophets" as regards Lucian. Another acknowledgment which pleased me was the tribute paid (p. 183) to Andrew Lang's *Letters to Dead Authors*. They should be commended to all the younger generation.

Professor Allinson's easy and lucid style is always a joy to read. His volume is a welcome addition to the series.

LOUIS E. LORD

OBERLIN COLLEGE

Ovid and his Influence (Our Debt to Greece and Rome). By EDWARD KENNARD RAND. Boston: Marshall Jones Company, 1925. Pp. 12 + 184. \$1.75.

Sellar remarks that in any century before the present (referring to the nineteenth) Ovid would have been placed in the first rank of Latin authors and among the great poets of the world. Perhaps the present has spoken the last word in literary criticism. Few critics would supplant Lucretius or Catullus, Vergil or Horace, by Ovid; not many would grant him a place by their side.

Professor Rand in *Ovid and his Influence* indicates several *aetates Ovidianae* in literary history: "the Ages of Faith, the Renaissance in all the countries of Europe, the times of Louis XIV in French literature, those of Elizabeth, the Restoration and Queen Anne." It may be that we have recovered today from Victorianism almost sufficiently to be on the road to another *aetas Ovidiana*.

The purpose of this book is to interpret Ovid to the modern generation. It has three parts: Ovid in the World of Poetry; Ovid Through the Centuries; Ovid the Modern. Two-thirds of the volume are devoted to the first part, which is as it should be. Most of the remainder carries the poet through history. A bare six pages discuss

him in the present, the brevity of which part is significant of his place in recent literature.

In Part I Professor Rand takes up in order The Poet of Love, The Poet of Transformations, The Poet of the Pagan Year, The Poet in Exile, giving a brief exposition and analysis of each of Ovid's works and an estimate of its place and value. Considering the space allowed he has succeeded admirably in conveying to the reader the meaning of each work.

The second part follows the poet through the Middle Ages and the Renaissance into modern times. He passes (as Professor Rand portrays him) through an amazing succession of metamorphoses. *Ethicus*, *theologicus*, *medicus*, and *magus* (for which in the Table of Contents there is the interesting misprint *magnus*) are forms which he assumes posthumously. With such formative forces in literature as Boccaccio, Chaucer, and Milton, Ovid is a marked favorite and a strong influence. "There is hardly an aspect of Ovid's genius and art that one will not see reproduced somewhere in Shakespeare."

In the short concluding part the author shows how modern the poet is and how far he deserves again, after his nineteenth-century eclipse, to come into literary prominence.

Professor Rand has a charm of style that is found in few books even of this series, of which the purpose calls for attractive style. It suffers a second or even a third reading with increasing delight.

The numerous verse renderings from Ovid's works, almost all done by the author, possess an exquisite appropriateness, which contributes in no small measure to the success of the volume. The quotations from literature, ancient and modern, that are placed at the head of many sections lend an added attractiveness to the book.

Ovid and his Influence is a sympathetic criticism. One may question whether the four *Heroides*, Paris to Helen and Helen to Paris, Acontius to Cydippe and Cydippe to Acontius, and the moonlit lines describing Leander's swim, would put Ovid in the front rank of poets, had he written nothing more (p. 32), especially as the battle regarding the authenticity of the last six *Heroides* still continues. The leading editor of the *Heroides* in recent times, Arthur Palmer (1898), very strongly holds the view that they are not by Ovid. Nor would this high estimate on the basis of his heroic epistles harmonize with the statement on page 20, "The poet has a modest garden, but he cultivates it intensively." Ovid will not again be acclaimed in the front

rank of poets. As a teller of tales he has few equals, but in pure poetry Palgrave was not far wrong.

Professor Rand will bring delight and enlightenment to his readers through this volume, which is one of the most felicitous pieces of literary appreciation that has appeared in many a day.

RAYMOND H. COON

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Demosthenes: De Corona and De Falsa Legatione. Translated by C. A. VINCE and J. H. VINCE. (Loeb Classical Library) London: William Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1926.

Demosthenes and His Influence. By CHARLES DARWIN ADAMS. ("Our Debt To Greece and Rome" series) Longmans, Green and Company, New York, 1927.

Here are two excellent contributions to the study of Demosthenes. The Loeb volume comes from the hands of two English scholars identified with the long and brilliant Demosthenes tradition at Cambridge. From the middle of the sixteenth century, under the enthusiastic leadership of Sir John Cheke, Cambridge has been a flourishing center for the sympathetic interpretation of the greatest of the Attic orators. The present translation is representative of an honorable tradition.

A concise but adequate introduction precedes the translation of each oration and helps to clarify the too little known period of the last days of Greek liberty. The translators are clearly admirers of Demosthenes in his struggle against Philip.

The English versions reflect for the most part faithfully the fiery vigor, the splendid periods, and even the euphony of the originals. Both the primary and the secondary devices of rhetoric, so telling in the Greek, have been done into English with little loss of effect. Such difficult tricks as anaphora and paronomasia keep their power in English dress. No effort has been made to refine the translations. The vituperative parts are rendered in the picturesque idiom of the hus-tings. The translators never lose sight of the fact that the speeches were delivered in the heat of passion to sway the crowd. The peaks of eloquence, too, particularly in the *De Corona*, stand out in their declamatory force.

The text of the *De Corona* is based largely on the third edition of

Dindorf with some revisions following the Paris MS. The text of the *De Falsa Legatione* is based on that of Shilleto.

Professor Adams, of Dartmouth, discusses the career and influence of Demosthenes for the series, "Our Debt to Greece and Rome." His is a work of distinction that definitely enriches the quality of this series. Within the necessary confines of a small volume he sets forth the main problems connected with the life and art of the orator and adds illuminating chapters on his influence in classical antiquity and later Europe and America.

The author is a forthright defender of Demosthenes and a deep sympathizer with democracy. None of the current skepticism toward popular government is evident in his pages. He shows how Demosthenes suffered at the hands of the Tory Mitford and an influential school of German scholars in the nineteenth century. He presents the foe of Philip as a high-minded patriot, a sagacious statesman, and a sincere lover of liberty.

The apologetic section of the book naturally bristles with controversial material. Granted the lofty motives of the patriot and the blessings of liberty, must one also ascribe to Demosthenes the practical sagacity of the statesman? Professor Adams believes that there were substantial prospects for success in the Athenian struggle with Philip and that Demosthenes was by no means the leader of a lost cause from the beginning. Persia was ready to help. Thebes could be stiffened into strong resistance. More Greek states could be aroused. The combination would have ruined Philip. But could the political chaos of the fourth century in Greece be so easily put in order? Isocrates did not think so, nor was he in the pay of Philip. It is just the hopelessness of the cause that has led so many people to admire Demosthenes for his courageous stand. Certainly it is this element that constitutes the chief glory of the *De Corona*.

A second point of controversy centers around the fitness of Macedon for the hegemony of Greece. In the mind of Professor Adams, Philip was an irresponsible autocrat interested only in predatory conquests and the Macedonian people outside the heritage of Greek culture. Macedon triumphed, but at the cost of Greek liberty and the paralysis of Greek literary and artistic genius. Philip died before his true character as arbiter of Greek affairs could be gauged. Euripides and Aristotle found the Macedonians not entirely outside the pale of Greek culture. A Macedonian king of Egypt set up a library

and a museum. The Greek genius found expression in Menander, Theocritus, Zeno, Epicurus, Euclid, and Aristarchus despite the death of political liberties.

Nevertheless, Professor Adams has his heart in fifth-century Athens, and for him the defeat of Demosthenes and the triumph of Philip meant the reign of night.

His exposition of the oratorical art of Demosthenes is thorough and highly instructive. His illustrations, using his own translations, are excellently chosen.

The book admirably does what it set out to do. It presents vividly a picture of the man and his times and traces well the impression left by the man on subsequent ages.

STERLING TRACY

YALE UNIVERSITY

A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament. By H. E. DANA, TH.D., and JULIUS R. MANTEY, TH.D., D. D. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1927.

This *Manual Grammar* is likely to win many friends among both students and teachers of the Greek New Testament.

The authors, professors of New Testament interpretation in Baptist theological seminaries, are very precise in stating the object they had in view in writing the *Manual*. They have had to grapple, no doubt, with very definite problems in the classroom. To solve these, they set to work with splendid determination, as is apparent, and with the touch of the practical teacher. We have been familiar with Winer, Buttmann, Webster, Blass-Debrunner, Burton, Deissmann, Moulton, Robertson — a real galaxy of scholars. And yet, one thing was still lacking: "The need most keenly felt by present-day teachers of the Greek New Testament is for an accurate and comprehensive compendium which is adaptable to the average student." In the *Manual*, we now have "a comprehensive survey of the chief features of the grammar of the Greek New Testament in simple outline form, as an introduction to a more detailed and inductive study."

In content, the *Manual*, without being exhaustive, covers the whole field. After the first 41 pages, dealing with Accidence (Orthography, Declension, Conjugation), the main portion of the volume is devoted to an exposition of Syntax. There are three large Divisions: Noun, Verb, Clauses. The treatises on the Article, the eight Cases, and the

Tenses are particularly rich in information. There follows an Appendix with Paradigms, Exercises for Greek Composition, an English-Greek Vocabulary, and two Indexes. One misses a third Index, giving the references to all the Scripture texts quoted in the *Manual*. I will add that the sparing use, throughout the *Manual*, of quotations from the New Testament, compared with, say, Burton, while surprising, is no doubt the result of careful consideration.

The mode of procedure is simple. Each section opens with the definition of some term or an explanation of some grammatical fact. This is next illustrated by a quotation from the New Testament in both Greek and English. There follow almost invariably one or several paragraphs in small print, in which the authors dive deeper into the subject, explain matters of detail, and compare the opinions of leading scholars.

As to quality, the work exhibited in the *Manual* will be sufficiently characterized, I think, by saying that, although the authors show independence of judgment, they follow frankly in the footsteps of the author of *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*. The spirit of Robertson breathes in every page of the *Manual*. This accounts both for the merits of the book and, possibly, for a certain tone which the authors have adopted in the wording of their explanations. I have been wondering who the "average student" may be for whom this grammar was written. As an outgrowth of well-defined conditions in the seminaries in which the authors are teaching, the *Manual* is, I take it, the ideal book for their seminarians. For the rest of the world, the question of its usefulness is not so readily settled. The "average" student, as I know him, reads the Greek New Testament after a meager preparation of two years of ancient Greek, acquired in the high school. For him the βῶμα here served is on the whole too strong, in fact, partly indigestible. Some of the authors' explanations would themselves need an explanation to bring them home to these immature minds. The "simplest language possible" is of course an elastic term. But the *Manual* will do fine work in the hands of the advanced student, and will be consulted with profit by any teacher, whether of ancient or New Testament Greek.

In offering some comment by way of helpful criticism, I will limit myself to the treatise on the Present Tense. The uses of the present being but few in number, there seems little need for a division of

them into *regular* ("in which the root idea of progress is especially patent") and *special* ("in which the root idea is not so evidently patent and which are not of so frequent occurrence as the regular uses"). At any rate, the proposed division is not clean-cut; for 1) the historical present, being of frequent occurrence (252 times in the Synoptics), is listed as special; 2) the tendential (= conative) and the static present (the present of lasting condition), also classed as special, are decidedly regular, because in them the root idea of progress or the "state of persistence" is quite patent; 3) John 15:27 (ἀπ' ἀρχῆς μετ' ἐμοῦ ἔστε) is quoted to illustrate both the present of duration (a regular use) and the static present (a special use). In Matt. 26:2, παραδίδοται illustrates the futuristic present; but the translation ("is delivered") does not show this use. Moffat, Weymouth, and Goodspeed render "will be delivered." In John 10:32, λιθάξετε is called a tendential present; the translation should, therefore, be something like "you mean to stone me," rather than "you stone me." In Matt. 2:4, γεννᾶται is better explained, with Robertson and others, as futuristic than as tendential; it should be so listed also by the authors' own definition; for while the tendential present denotes events that "tend towards realization" (hence, for example, λιθάξετε: the Jews did not actually stone Christ), the futuristic includes events that come to pass at some future time (so Matt. 26:2, Luke 3:9, and John 14:3, all quoted by the authors). Also, there is an occasional tendency to over-refinement, as in the statement, "the perfect stresses existence of results but not their continuance."

The *Manual* is intended for students doing advanced work in New Testament Greek. Along with it, two or three well-known treatises that deal exclusively with the New Testament are expected to be used for continual reference. Now it would surely be a pity if the very excellence of our New Testament books and their apparent completeness of equipment were to prove a temptation to the students in their career as scholars. There are so many good things crowded into these manuals that students may feel tempted to remain content with them, without any professional contact with ancient Greek. The *Koine* is not a detached entity. It cannot be fully understood *e visceribus propriis*. Its very life-blood flows in direct streams from the heart of that incomparable language of which it is the offspring. In one sense a language of decadence, it is in numerous other senses a legitimate development of classical Greek. It is the last flowering of seeds

sown in older soil. The *Koine* itself, therefore, points imperatively to the mastery of ancient Greek as the starting point or, at any rate, as an indispensable condition, for its own comprehension. Let the reader who has not tried the experiment read a piece of ancient Greek, say Homer, simultaneously with the narrative portions of the New Testament, and the experience will prove refreshing and illuminating. Even the so-called vagaries, nay, the very uncouthness of Mark, are lit up by innumerable flashes from the lamps of ancient Greek. A detailed study of the philology of any part of the New Testament will reveal the fact that the ordinary colloquial tongue of the day, spoken throughout the Graeco-Roman world and preserved in the New Testament, has retained with remarkable tenacity some of the finest touches of genuine Greek. Speaking broadly, New Testament Greek rings true. Now, while classical scholars can shift without New Testament Greek, the students of the latter need the help of the former. The *Manual Grammar*, therefore, and New Testament grammars in general, are a real boon to the student who needs them, but they do not shatter the belief that the safest approach to New Testament Greek still lies, as it has lain in the past, through the glorious portals of ancient Greek.

JAMES A. KLEIST

JOHN CARROLL UNIVERSITY

Antiquity: A Quarterly Review of Archaeology. Edited by O. G. S. CRAWFORD, F.S.A. Printed and published by John Bellows, Gloucester, England. Vol. I, 1927.

This is the most gratifying publication of its kind that has been inaugurated of recent years, and one for which the archaeologist has for long — though perhaps subconsciously — been hoping. The first number saw the light in March, 1927, and the first volume has just seen completion under the able editorship of Mr. O. G. S. Crawford, the distinguished British archaeologist and Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries.

It is impossible for a single individual to be a specialist in all departments of archaeological research. To a greater degree is it impossible for a man to keep at hand a detailed knowledge of the results of excavation in all parts of the world. In view of the vast increase in archaeological knowledge, as well as interest, that has come about in the present century, and particularly in post-war

years, the idea was happily conceived by a group of scholars of offering to the public a journal which should attempt to be all-embracing in this special field of research. The result was the coming into being of *Antiquity*.

This quarterly review stands midway, as it were, between the archaeological journals which are the playground and the delight of the specialist and the (usually sadly muddled) accounts of discoveries which are furnished by the daily press or in the almost equally unsatisfactory monthly digest. *Antiquity* is "popular" reading only in the sense that its contents may be readily understood by the man of intellectual enterprise who is interested in new discoveries and is willing to take time to do his reading with care, without the necessity of his possessing any special knowledge or training in the archaeological field.

That the journal is stout and substantial and at the same time well illustrated is attested by the 522 pages of the first volume and by some sixty plates of full-page size, together with sporadic figures, drawings, and plans. In Bellows, of Gloucester, the editor has found an admirable printer and publisher. Each number opens with a series of illuminating editorial notes. These are followed by six or eight articles of from six to a dozen pages each. While they are not heavily documented, and avoid extremely technical terms, the light and journalistic element is conspicuously absent. So also are polemical articles and those dealing with minute topics. It would appear that the contributors are requested or instructed to choose a reasonably wide field for their exploitation, and to furnish the reader with a succinct account of its most recent phase of development. Notes and news — fortunately not of the "tabloid" form — granting information regarding current and forthcoming excavations, fill a considerable section; and the last portion is taken up with reviews, which vary in length from a few lines to several pages.

From this first volume, North and South American archaeology has been excluded; that ample space will later be found for it is a logical inference from a declaration of the editor's. To fill up the leading articles alone, Asia, Africa, Europe, and even New Zealand have contributed each its share. Of those possessing a particular interest for the classical student, the following may be noted: D. Randall MacIver writes with his usual brilliance on the present status of Etruscan studies — provenance, language, art, and history.

Professor Alexander Shewan, the Homeric scholar, contributes a valuable essay on the Homeric Ithaca, whose identification has caused so much controversy for many years. Three of the articles deal with Roman Britain, of which the most illuminating is perhaps "The Roman Frontier in Britain," from the pen of the distinguished Romano-British authority, R. G. Collingwood. The reader whose interests lie in the wider aspects of history will find here two interesting studies, by the same author, of the now well-known theory of Spengler regarding historical cycles. Among the Notes, one observes such titles as, "Recent Work in Greek Lands," "Roman Barrows," "The Lake of Nemi," "Recent Work in Crete."

To predict that this journal will be widely read in America in the near future would be the error of one expecting too much. But *Antiquity* ought to find a place on the bookshelf of every well-informed student of the classics who hopes to keep abreast of the times. It will be of particular service to the specialist in classical archaeology whose activities and duties are such as to preclude the possibility of his maintaining a close contact with discoveries in other lands than classical.

A. D. FRASER

ALFRED UNIVERSITY

The Etruscans. By DAVID RANDALL-MACIVER. Oxford University Press, 1927. Pp. 152. \$2.00.

For anyone traveling, in imagination or in person, through that part of Italy lying between the Tevere and Arno rivers, this will be an illuminating little guidebook. With deft, sure strokes Mr. Randall-MacIver sketches in the archaeological evidence which enables us to reconstruct, with some degree of satisfaction, the Etruscan civilization; he gives advice with regard to visiting sites, and provides sixteen fairly adequate illustrations and a map. Unfortunately he fails to include the bibliography that any such summary should have.

In the author's opinion, detachments of Etruscans began to migrate to Italy from Asia Minor, perhaps from Lydia, about 800 B.C. They were an alert commercial and military people, who promptly subdued the local tribes and created an oligarchical control, with the subject peoples tilling the fields and serving as infantry, the Etruscan nobles devoting themselves to commerce and sport, art and war. By 500 B.C., when they reached the height of their political prestige, they

ruled over a large part of Italy. But they were always latently oriental, and when they faced the political competence and the iron will of Rome their power quickly crumbled. Mr. Randall-MacIver believes that they borrowed less from Greece and gave more to Rome than most scholars would admit. The Etruscans, he says, were clever in adapting Egypto-Assyrian and Greek art forms; but they also created a culture quite their own in architecture and sculpture, and in language, religion, and customs. Their craftsmanship in gold and bronze was, of course, exceptionally able. In his enthusiastic support of his thesis, he is occasionally guilty of rash statements (*e.g.*, "The sculptors of the Roman Empire owe less to the Greeks than to the Etruscans."); for a more critical and penetrating appraisal, accompanied by an excellent bibliography, Volume IV of the Cambridge Ancient History should be consulted. But for the most part Mr. Randall-MacIver's interpretation of this enigmatic people is expressed with moderation and good-humored fairness.

W. R. AGARD

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

Recent Books

Compiled by HARRY M. HUBBELL, Yale University

- BRYANT, E. E., and LAKE, E. D. C. *An Elementary Greek Grammar and Greek Exercises*. New edition, two volumes in one. Oxford Univ. Press, 1927. Pp. 222. \$1.50.
- Caesar. *Gallic War, Books I-III*. Partly in the Original and Partly in Translation. Edited by C. HIGNETT. Oxford Univ. Press, 1928. Pp. 160. 2s. 6d.
- CALHOUN, GEORGE MILLER, and DELAMERE, CATHERINE. *A Working Bibliography of Greek Law*. (Harvard Series of Legal Bibliographies) Harvard Univ. Press, 1927. Pp. 163. \$4.00.
- Cicero. *Somnium Scipionis*. Translated by J. F. STOUT. *Pro Rege Deiotaro*. Translated by R. E. V. CARY. Univ. Tutorial Press, 1927. Pp. 35. 1s. 6d.
- CLARK, FRANK LOWRY. *A Study of the Iliad in Translation*. Univ. of Chicago Press, 1927. Pp. 363. \$3.00.
- Ἐπιτάφιον. HEINRICH SWOBODA *dargebracht*. Reichenberg: Gebrüder Stiepel, 1927. Pp. xi + 385.
- HEINTZELER, GERHARD. *Das Bild des Tyrannen bei Platon*. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der griechischen Staatsethik. Diss. Tübingen, 1927. Pp. 124.
- NAIRN, J. ARBUTHNOT. *Greek Prose Composition*. School edition. Macmillan, 1927. Pp. 176. \$2.00.
- NOWACKI, ADALBERTUS. *Philittae Coi Fragmenta Poetica*. Diss. Münster, 1927. Pp. 88.
- Plato. *Euthyphro*. Introduction, Text and Notes. Edited by T. R. MILLS. Univ. Tutorial Press, 1927. Pp. 60. 3s.
- PLATT, ARTHUR. *Nine Essays*. With a preface by A. E. HOUSMAN. Cambridge Univ. Press, 1927. Pp. xi + 220.
- REMPE, JOHANNES. *De Rheso Thracum Heroe*. Diss. Münster, 1927. Pp. 55.
- SCUDDER, JARED WATERBURY. *Second Latin. Book II*. (François-Scudder Latin Course) Allyn & Bacon, 1927. Pp. 658. Ill. \$1.80.
- SRAGO, HEZECHIEL. *De L. Coelio Antipatro Livii in L. XXI Auctore*. Diss. Jena, 1927. Pp. 71.